**DISCLAIMER:**

This document does not meet the
current format guidelines of
the Graduate School at
The University of Texas at Austin.

It has been published for
informational use only.

The Dissertation Committee for John North Hopkins
certifies that this is the approved version of the following dissertation:

# THE TOPOGRAPHICAL TRANSFORMATION OF ARCHAIC ROME:

## A NEW INTERPRETATION OF ARCHITECTURE AND GEOGRAPHY IN THE EARLY CITY

Committee:

_____
Penelope J. E. Davies, Co-Supervisor

_____
John R. Clarke, Co-Supervisor

_____
Albert J. Ammerman

_____
Ingrid E. M. Edlund-Berry

_____
Nassos Papalexandrou

_____
Andrew M. Riggsby

# THE TOPOGRAPHICAL TRANSFORMATION OF ARCHAIC ROME:

# A NEW INTERPRETATION OF ARCHITECTURE AND GEOGRAPHY IN THE EARLY CITY

by

John North Hopkins, B.S.; M.A.

**Dissertation**

Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of

The University of Texas at Austin

in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements

for the Degree of

**Doctor of Philosophy**

The University of Texas at Austin

May 2010

# Acknowledgements

I owe profound thanks to Penelope J.E. Davies and John R. Clake for their unrelenting support and guidance as advisors throughout my graduate work and especially on this dissertation. It is hard to put in words my gratitude for their insight, opinion, criticism and interest; they truly have gone beyond the call of duty and this work is vastly improved for it. I will not soon forget the conversations and debates we have had in Austin and Rome.

Albert Ammerman offered information on the most recent discoveries and opinions running through the world of early Rome and was an inimitable guide to writing on such a contentious set of monuments from such a fraught period.

Ingrid Edlund-Berry and Nassos Papalexandrou offered essential insights into the world of Early Italic and Greek material culture that I had missed, and their reading of the final version of this dissertation proved critical to its viability as a work on contact between so many cultures. I am heartily grateful for their sober analysis.

Andrew Riggsby was the voice of reason from outside the world of material culture, and I am grateful for his remarks both on the literary history and overall conceptions of early Rome.

While in Rome, I was lucky enough to befriend Nancy Winter; her masterful knowledge of archaic terracottas transformed my perception of early Rome and the Mediterranean, and I will forever be grateful of the time I had to learn from such a scholar. Hellen (Ili) Nage and Elizabeth Bartman both spent meal after meal hearing my thoughts and were kind enough to provide feedback informally. Above all meetings I had in Rome, one dinner with Thomas McGinn, Hellen Nage, Elizabeth Fentress and Margaret Miles shaped not only the format of this dissertation, but also the way I conceived of the ancient city.

James Packer read the second chapter of this work and offered invaluable feedback both on content and on directions to go in the future; he has been a constant and ever-welcome mentor, critic and friend.

The University of Texas at Austin provided both resources and funding for the completion of this dissertation. I owe no small thanks to the Department of Art and Art History for their support in my degree and toward a Cullen Trust Endowment Fund Fellowship, which made a year's research in Rome possible. Shiela Winchester, Laura Schwartz and the Inter-library Loan staff made research in Austin—and the completion of this work—possible. The American Council of Learned Societies funded the last year I worked on this dissertation and I am grateful for the freedom I had in those last months to so freely work on my conclusions back in Austin.

The American Academy in Rome provided funding and housing for the two primary years of research, but it would be unjust to suggest that the Rome prize offered only these benefits. The library staff at the Academy, especially Denise Gavio, Christina Huemer and Rebecca Lindau truly made research a pleasure, and without the support and assistance of the incomparable programs office—Anne Coulson, Giulia Barra and Lexi Eberspracher—I would not have seen half of the sights I needed to for this work.

While on the fellowship I also met and gained insight from scholars from around Rome and visiting from Europe and the U.S. Anna Mura Sommella, Gabrielle Cifani, Nicola Terrenato, Emanuelle Papi, Gregory Bucher, Simonetta Serra, Larissa Bonfante, Paolo Carafa, Pier Luigi Tucci, Lynne Lancaster, are but a few, and these meager words do not do justice to the profound effect each has had on this work. I owe special thanks to Gabrielle Cifani for his generosity.

Of course, this kind of research would not be possible without the good will of many museums and archaeological superintendencies in Italy. At the Capitoline Museums: Claudio Parisi-Presice, Marghereta Albertoni, Alberto Danti; at the Sopraintendenza Archeologica di Lazio: Giovanni Caruso; at the Museo di Velletri: Dott.sa Germano; at the Comune di Lanuvio: Luca Attenni, Francesco Graziani; at the Museo di Cerveteri, dott. Fabrizio Paganelli; at the Museo di Tarquinia, Massimo Magrini, so patient and helpful; at the Villa Giulia: Rita Cosentino; at the Soprintendenza Speciale per i Beni Archeologici di Roma: among others Roberto Meneghini, Elisabetta Bianchi, Irene Iacopi. At Roma Sotterranea: Luca Antognoli.

This dissertation would not be possible, however, without the great support of my parents, Ted and Katherine Hopkins, and the rest of my wonderful family. Fortune smiled brightly when she placed me in such careful arms. To have been brought up among such keen, inquisitive minds—ever curious about this world and our humanity—was a true gift, and your undying interest in learning sparked the intellectual curiosity that lies at the foundation of my endeavors. Thank you.

In this version of the dissertation, uploaded to UT digital libraries, I have excluded images because of the difficulty of obtaining permissions for so many images and for so small a project. If this becomes a more earnestly published book I will secure permissions and include images. In the meantime I have included references to all images in the list of illustrations, and readers are welcome to contact me if they desire to see a particular figure.

**THE TOPOGRAPHICAL TRANSFORMATION OF ARCHAIC ROME:**

**A NEW INTERPRETATION OF ARCHITECTURE AND GEOGRAPHY IN THE EARLY CITY**

John North Hopkins, Ph.D.

The University of Texas at Austin, 2010

Supervisors: John R. Clarke and Penelope J.E. Davies

Most studies of Roman architecture cover the third century BCE to the fourth century CE, a period of luxurious building projects like the Colosseum and Pantheon that remain relatively well documented in the archaeological and literary record. Yet Rome did not spring fully formed from the ground in the third century, its architecture relying entirely on precursors and precedents in buildings from far away times and places. In this study I fit remains of architecture from early Rome (ca. 650 to 450 BCE) into the cultural framework of the contemporaneous Mediterranean and try to assess how the changing cityscape effected both archaic Romans and later Roman architecture and topography. Because many studies of archaic Rome have attempted to fit archaeological remains with the literary record, and because this has created much controversy, I put the literary record to one side and focus on material remains in an attempt to see what they can reveal on their own.

## Table of Contents

**List of Figures**……..……...viii

**Chapter 1.** An Introduction to public architecture in archaic Rome..……...……1

**Chapter 2.** Creating the Forum Romanum:
the transformation and monumentalization of an artificial urban space...…25

**Chapter 3.** The riverside sanctuary at S. Omobono
and the mixing of foreign and local cultures…….....…....108

**Chapter 4**. The Temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus on the Capitoline……..200

**Chapter 5.** Conclusions: the changing city and its architecture……277

**Figures**…….…….…….…….……287

**Appendix**…….…….…….…….……444

**Bibliography**…….…….…….…….……...448

# List of Illustrations

**Chapter 1.** An Introduction to public architecture in archaic Rome

1.1 Corinthian olpe from Tomb 125 on the Esquiline
a. vase. From Mura Sommella 2000
b. detail of inscription. From Mura Sommella 2000

1.2 Peperino chest from Esquiline, lid removed, cinerary urn inside it. Photo by author

1.3 Parian marble cinerary urn from Esquiline. Photo by author

1.4 Plan of hills with location of temple remains indicated by a black dot. By author

1.5 Amazon from Esquiline. Photo by author

1.6 Amazon from Esquiline with reconstruction of attacker. From Lulof 2007, Fig. 12

1.7 Column casing and anthemion relief from Velia. From Gjerstad 1953-1973 Vol. III, Fig. 90

1.8 Female Antefix head from above Palatine Huts. Photo by author

1.9 Excavated cappellaccio foundation behind Temple of "Victoria Virgo." From Pensabene 2001, Fig. 55

1.10 Antefixes of Juno Sospita from behind Temple of "Victoria Virgo." Photo by author

1.11 Veii–Rome–Velletri reliefs from below House of Livia. Photo by author

1.12 Wall and road on northeast slope of Palatine. From Cifani 2008, Fig. 145

1.13 Plan of southwest corner of Palatine with archaic remains of cisterns, temple and retaining walls. From Pensabene 2001, Fig. 54

1.14 Plan of cistern by Palatine huts (labeled E in fig. 1.13). From Gjerstad 1953-1973 Vol. III, Fig. 58

1.15 Cistern below Domus Augustana
A. Plan. From Gjerstad 1953-1973 Vol. III, Fig. 71
B. Elevation. From Gjerstad 1953-1973 Vol. III, Fig. 72

1.16 Reconstructed plan of houses on north slope of Palatine. From Filippi 2004a, Fig. 4

1.17 Reconstructed plan of houses on north slope of Palatine. See dashed rectangle in Fig. 1.16. From Carandini 1995 [2000], Pl. 63

1.18 Plan of "House of Tarquinius"
A. Reconstruction of house after Carandini 2004. From Wiseman 2008, Fig. 54
B. Plan of remains and "probable structures" after Carandini 2004. From Wiseman 2008, Fig. 53
C. Plan of actual remains after Carandini 2004. From Wiseman 2008, Fig. 52

1.19 Domus 3.
A. Hypothetical reconstruction. From Carandini 1995 [2000], Pl. 64
B. Plan of actual remains. From Carandini 1995 [2000], Pl. V

**Chapter 2.** Creating the Forum Romanum

2.1 The Forum Valley and Velabrum. Plan of valley after reclamation. Raised area in grey. By author

2.2 Equus Domitiani excavations. Section. From Gjerstad 1953-1973 Vol. I, Fig. 9

2.3 Equus Domitiani excavations. Finds from Stratum 20. From Gjerstad 1953-1973 Vol. I, Fig. 40

2.4 Equus Domitiani excavations. Wall from Stratum 21. From Gjerstad 1953-1973 Vol. I, Fig. 6

2.5 Equus Domitiani excavations. Bodies from below stratum 28. From Gjerstad 1953-1973 Vol. I, Fig. 29

2.6 Equus Domitiani excavations. Travertine block with ceramics. From Gjerstad 1953-1973 Vol. I, Fig. 59

2.7 Equus Domitiani excavations. Selected finds from Strata 23-28. From Gjerstad 1953-1973 Vol. I, Figs. 31–36

2.8 The Sepulcretum. From Gjerstad 1953-1973 Vol. I, Fig. 65

2.9 Burial sites on the Esquiline. From Gjerstad 1953-1973 Vol. I, Fig. 145

2.10 Comitium. Phases 2 and 3. After Gjerstad 1941, Fig. 6

2.11 Cores in the Comitium. Stratigraphic chart. From Boni 1900, P. 338-339

2.12 Roof tiles from the Comitium pavement 1.
a. reconstruction of roof. From Boni 1900, Fig. 31
b. excavation trench, stratum with tiles. From Boni 1900, Fig. 31

2.13 Section and chart of Squarciapino trench "under Imperial monument" with pavement 1a marked. From Carafa 1998, Fig. 70 and p. 81

2.14 Chart of Pavements. Pav. 2 = Coarelli pavement 1. From Carafa 1998, p. 87

2.15 Chart of SQ12. From Carafa 1998, p. 79

2.16 Chart of Trincea III. From Carafa 1998, p. 77

2.17 Map of settled areas in Rome before the archaic period. By author

2.18 Map of central Rome with area below nine-masl in blue. By author

2.19 Map of central Rome with nine-masl marker and floodplain in blue. After Ammerman 2004, Fig. 3

2.20 Elevation of Capitoline, Forum and Palatine. After Ammerman 1990, Fig. 3

2.21 Gravel bed location. From Ammerman 2004, Fig. 8

2.22 Contour map showing elevations of gully between Palatine and Velia. After Ammerman 1992, Fig. 58

2.23 Map of Capitoline, Forum and Palatine with streams in blue. After Ammerman 2004, Fig. 3

2.24 Regia, area of small huts, probably for animals. Photographic Archive of the American Academy in Rome / Fototeca Unione, R74.2

2.25 Palatine, seventh century sanctuary on southwest slope. From Zeggio 2006, Fig. 3

2.26 Model of huts in Palatine Museum. Photo by author.

2.27 Palatine, wall in orange. From Carandini 1995 [2000], Pl. 21

2.28 Equus Domitiani excavations. Stratum 27. From Gjerstad 1953-1973 Vol. I, Fig. 21

2.29 Central Rome after the reclamation project. 3-D reconstruction. View from above Palatine. Inhabited areas in Red. By author

2.30 Core sections from Velabrum. From Ammerman 1998, Fig. 2

2.31 Map of cores in Velabrum. From Ammerman 1998, Fig. 1

2.32 Central Rome after the reclamation project with roadways and embankment wall. 3-D reconstruction. View from Tiber. By author

2.33 Central Rome, streams in the Forum valley. By author

2.34 Path of Cloaca Maxima in the Forum. From Bauer 1989, Abb. 20

2.35 Central Rome after reclamation. 3-D reconstruction. By author
A. From Regia
B. From "Vicus Tuscus"

2.36 Selinunte, acropolis terrace. Plan. From Mertens 2006, Fig. 323

2.37 Selinunte, acropolis terrace. From Mertens 2006, Fig. 325

2.38 Clay canal near Bologna.
a. Partially excavated. From Ortalli 1994, Pl. 1
b. Plan of canal. From Ortalli 1994, Fig. 1

2.39 Comitium, phase II. Location of cippus. After Gjerstad 1941, Pl. I

2.40 Comitium, phase II. Cippus. Inscription. From Cristofani, *et al.* 1990, Fig. 3.1.29

2.41 Comitium, phase III.
a. Plan of excavations with phase III outlined in red. After Gjerstad 1941, Pl. I
b. Reconstruction of platform in Comitium. Plan. After Gjerstad 1941, Fig. 6

2.42 Comitium, phase III. Reconstruction of platform. From Gjerstad 1941, Fig. 9

2.43 Comitium, phase IV. Reconstruction of platform in Comitium with altar G. Plan. After Gjerstad 1941, Fig. 6

2.44 Sepulcretum. Plan of Houses. After Gjerstad 1953-1973 Vol. I, Fig. 129

2.45 Regia. Phases I-II, plan of excavations and reconstruction. Photographic Archive of the American Academy in Rome / Fototeca Unione, R74.4-7

2.46 Regia. Phase I, detail of area E: break in stone for door to southern room.
a. Composite of area E. Photographic Archive of the American Academy in Rome / Fototeca Unione, R75.33
b. Area E, finds in stratum of phase I. Photographic Archive of the American Academy in Rome / Fototeca Unione, R75.37

2.47 Regia. Phase III, plan of excavations and reconstruction. Photographic Archive of the American Academy in Rome / Fototeca Unione, R74.8-9

2.48 Regia. Phase III, Disc acroterion. From Downey 1995, Fig. 71

2.49 a. Regia. Phase III, Gorgon Antefix. From Downey 1995, Fig. 18
b. Lapis Niger, Gorgon Antefix. From Downey 1995, Fig. 21

2.50 Regia. Phase III, Frieze plaque. From Cristofani, *et al.* 1990, Fig.3.2.13

2.51 Regia. Phase IV, plan of excavations and foundations. Photographic Archive of the American Academy in Rome / Fototeca Unione, R74.10-11

2.52 Regia. Phase IV, female head antefix. From Downey 1995 Fig. 61

2.53 Regia. Phase V, plan of excavations and reconstruction. Photographic Archive of the American Academy in Rome / Fototeca Unione, R75.12-13

2.54 Regia. Phase V, detail of saggio 3,2. Elevation of walls in south rooms. Photographic Archive of the American Academy in Rome / Fototeca Unione, R75.1, 75.12

2.55 Regia. Phase V, detail of sondaggio 6b paving stones (pavement preparation layer in grey). Photographic Archive of the American Academy in Rome / Fototeca Unione, R75.33, 75.35

2.56 Regia. Phase V, detail of sondaggio 6c/d with paving stones, walls and canal. Photographic Archive of the American Academy in Rome / Fototeca Unione, R75.46, 75.48

2.57 Regia. Phase V, elevation of sondaggio 6c/d with paving stones and wall outlined in dashes. Photographic Archive of the American Academy in Rome / Fototeca Unione, R75.48, 75.57

2.58 Regia. Phase VI, plan. From Scott 1999, Fig. 81

2.59 Athens, Agora. Building F and Bouleuterion, plan. From Thompson 1940, Fig. 32

2.60 Atrium Vestae. Reconstruction of late archaic site. From Arvanitis 2004, Fig. 1

2.61 Temple of Castor. Elevation. From Nielsen 1990, Fig. 6

2.62 Temple of Castor. Plan of foundations of archaic temple. From Nielsen 1992, Pl. 12.1

2.63 Temple of Castor. Plan of archaic temple. After Nielsen 1992, Fig. 55

2.64 a. Temple of Castor. Anthemion decoration. From Nielsen 1992, Pl. 37.3
b. Temple of Castor. Full-bodied antefix, feet. From Nielsen 1992, Pl. III.2
c. Temple of Castor. Full-bodied antefix, head. From Cristofani 1990, Fig.3.4.5
d. Temple of Castor. Open-work cresting. From Nielsen 1992, Pl. II.2

2.65 Four examples of grid foundations in Central Italic Temples (not to scale). By author
a. Temple of Castor. Foundations of archaic temple. From Nielsen 1992, Pl. 12.1
b. Marzabotto, Temples A & C. After Colonna 2006, Fig. VIII.15
c. Pyrgi, Temples A and B. After Colonna 2006, Fig. VIII.1
d. Rome, Capitoline Temple. By author

2.66 Four examples of correlations between foundation and superstructure in Central Italic Temples (not to scale). By author
a. Orvieto. After Colonna 2006, Fig. VIII.43
b. Tarquinia, Ara della Regina. After Colonna 1985, Fig. 4.4
c. Ardea, Colle della Noce. After Di Mario 2007, Fig. 7
d. Lanuvium. After Galieti 1928, Fig. 1

2.67 Excavations under Basilica Julia. Stratum 11, ashlar wall. From Carettoni 1961, Pl. IV.2

2.68 Silens Head from Excavations under Basilica Julia. From Cristofani, *et al.* 1990, Fig.3.4.5

2.69 Reconstructed plan of archaic Temple of Saturn with tuff walls in Grey. From Cifani 2008, Fig. 89

2.70 Temple of Saturn. Wall embedded in Imperial podium. Photo by author

2.71 Map of Northwest end of Forum with "Ara Saturni." From Coarelli 1977, Pl. I

2.72 Two stone pavements by Temple of Castor. From Nielsen 1990, Fig. 9

2.73 Equus Domitiani excavation, Stone pavement. From Gjerstad 1953-1973 Vol. I, Fig. 7

2.74 a. Tuff slabs from "Sacra Via." From Carandini, *et al.* 1995 [2000], Fig. 195
b. Plan of "Sacra Via" and "house." From Carandini *et al.* 1995 [2000], Pl. 52

2.75 Forum ca. 475. Plan of major known monuments. By author

2.76 Forum ca. 625-590. Plan of major known monuments. By author

2.77 Forum ca. 590-540. Plan of major known monuments. By author

2.78 Forum ca. 540-500. Plan of major known monuments. By author

**Chapter 3.** The riverside sanctuary at S. Omobono and the mixing of foreign and local culture

3.1 Site of S. Omobono. View from southwest. From Colini 1938, Pl. L.

3.2 Site of S. Omobono. Plan of twin temple platform and surrounding roadways. By author

3.3 Site of S. Omobono. Plan of temples and excavation trenches. Various authors 1989, Fig. 1

3.4 Site of S. Omobono. 1959 excavation trench, section A-B-C. From Gjerstad 1969, Fig. 245

3.5 Site of S. Omobono. 1959 excavation trench, section A-D. From Gjerstad 1969, Fig. 246

3.6 Site of S. Omobono. section of Temple I podium and layers below. After Pisani Sartorio and Virgili 1979, Fig. 3

3.7 Site of S. Omobono. Plan of Temple I with trenches in dotted line. By author

3.8 Site of S. Omobono. 1962-64 excavation trenches IVE and IID, section. From Ioppolo 1971-1972, Pl. I

3.9 Site of S. Omobono. 1977-78 excavation trench, section. From Pisani Sartorio and Virgili 1979, Fig. 2

3.10 Site of S. Omobono. Temple I, stair. From Ioppolo 1971-1972, Fig. 7

3.11 Site of S. Omobono. Temple, altar. From Ioppolo 1971-1972, Fig. 5

3.12 Site of S. Omobono. Temple II, stair. From Colonna 1991, Fig. 4

3.13 Site of S. Omobono. Temple II, stair. From Virgili 1977, Fig. 5

3.14 Site of S. Omobono. Temple II, plan with stair marked. After Colonna 1991, Fig. 2b

3.15 Ivory Lion from votive deposit of Temple II at S. Omobono. Top: recto; Bottom: verso with inscription *araz silqetenas spurianas*. From Cristofani, ed. 1990, Pl. I

3.16 Site of S. Omobono. 1974-75 excavation trench, section. From Virgili 1977, Fig. 3

3.17 Site of S. Omobono. 1959 excavation trench, composite of sections A-B-C and A-D. From Ioppolo 1971-1972, Fig. 8

3.18 Site of S. Omobono. Twin Temple foundations, cappellaccio pillar. Photo by author

3.19 Site of S. Omobono. 1938 excavations, N-S section of Twin Temple foundations. From Colini 2000, Pl. VI.2

3.20 Site of S. Omobono. Twin Temple foundation, rear wall, east of west temple cella. Photo by author

3.21 Site of S. Omobono. 1938 excavations, section of Twin Temple foundations, at western edge of platform. From Colini 2000, P. 91

3.22 Site of S. Omobono. 1938 excavations, E-W section of Twin Temple foundations, west temple. From Colini 2000, Pl. VI.1

3.23 Site of S. Omobono. Twin Temple foundation, west temple, cappellaccio blocks below cella walls. Photo by author

3.24 Site of S. Omobono. Twin Temple foundation, east temple, cappellaccio blocks below alae wall (or colonnade). Photo by author

3.25 Site of S. Omobono. Twin Temple foundation, forecourt, southeast area, platform. Photo by author

3.26 Site of S. Omobono. Twin Temple foundation, forecourt, southwest area, platform. Photo by author

3.27 Site of S. Omobono. Plan of Twin Temples with visible cappellaccio remains marked in grey. Plan by author
A. Fig. 2.18
B. Fig. 2.20
C. Fig. 2.26
D. Fig. 2.25
E. Fig. 2.23
F. Fig. 2.24

3.28 Site of S. Omobono. Temple I moulding, as seen in 1977-78 excavation trench. From Various authors 1989, Fig. 12

3.29 Round mouldings from Central Italic temples. From Edlund-Berry and Shoe-Meritt 2000, Pl. 23
1-2: Ardea moulding
3-4: Satricum moulding

3.30 Inscription reading "uqnus" from layer below Temple I. Top: from Various authors 1989, Fig. 34; Bottom: from Cristofani, ed. 1990, Fig. 1.5

3.31 Laminate bronze figures from deposit around Temple II. From Various authors 1989, Pl. XV

3.32 Amber, ivory and bone deposits from around Temple II. From Cristofani, ed. 1990, Pl. X a-b

3.33 Site of S. Omobono. Remaining Monteverde pavement outlined in red. Photo by author

3.34 Site of S. Omobono. Twin temple platform, two Monteverde pavements outlined in red. Photo by author

3.35 S. Omobono. Terracotta feline revetment. Drawing. From Mura Sommella 1977, Fig. 12

3.36 Roof of Temples at S. Omobono with feline revetments highlighted. Photo by author

3.37 S. Omobono. Terracotta pediment plaques. Drawing. After Mura Sommella 1977, Figs. 14–15

3.38 Eaves of roof of Temple I at S. Omobono. Reconstruction of sima revetments and terracotta pediment plaques. After Mura Sommella 2000, Figs. 12–13

3.39 Tarquinia, Monterozzi necropolis. Tomb of the Leopards, rear wall. Photo by author

3.40 Tarquinia, Monterozzi necropolis. Tomb of the Lionesses, rear wall, upper register. Photo by author

3.41 Proto-Attic amphora from Piraeus. Detail of seated lion. From Mertens-Horn 1994, Pl. IX

3.42 Seated Lion from Perachora. From Mertens-Horn 1994, Pl. VI

3.43 Chigi Vase. Detail of lion hunt. From www.beazley.ox.ac.uk, accessed 4/23/09

3.44 Syracuse. Temple of Athena, terracotta pediment revetment of Gorgon. From Orsi 1903, Pl. XV

3.45 Corfu. Temple of Artemis, reconstruction drawing of pediment. From Rodenwaldt 1939, Taf. 26

3.46 Temple II at S. Omobono, terracotta sculpture of Hercules and Minerva. From Cristofani 1990, Pl. IX

3.47 Temple II at S. Omobono, terracotta sculpture of Hercules, left side. From Mura Sommella 1977, Fig. 42

3.48 Temple II at S. Omobono, terracotta sculpture of Hercules and Minerva, rear. From Mura Sommella 1977, Fig. 3

3.49 Temple II at S. Omobono, terracotta sculpture Minerva, left profile. Drawing. From Mura Sommella 1977, Fig. 26

3.50 Temple II at S. Omobono, terracotta sculpture Minerva, head. From Gjerstad 1960, Fig. 283

3.51 Votive statue (Kore F1) from Lavinium, three views. From Castagnoli 1975, Fig. 406

3.52 Two statues of Herakles from Cyprus. From Gjerstad 1934.
A. Fig. 23.236
B. Fig. 34.131

3.53 Three views of Anavysos Kouros. Photos by author.

3.54 Temple I at S. Omobono, terracotta sima revetment with head of lion. From Mura Sommella 1977, Fig. 3

3.55 Temple I at S. Omobono, terracotta sima revetment with tail of lion. From Mura Sommella 1977, Fig. 4

3.56 Corinthian aryballos. Detail of processing lion. American Academy in Rome Study collection, inventory number 544. Photo by author with permission of the American Academy in Rome

3.57 Temple II at S. Omobono, terracotta sima revetment with procession. From Mura Sommella 1977, Fig. 9

3.58 Temple II at S. Omobono, terracotta sima revetment with procession. Photo by author

3.59 Velletri. Temple at Ss. Stimmate, terracotta revetments. Top: banquet scene; Bottom: seated figures. From Fortunati 1986, Top: Fig. 5b; Bottom: Fig. 6a

3.60 Temple II at S. Omobono, terracotta roof tiles and lateral sima. Drawing. From Mura Sommella 1977, Fig. 16

3.61 Temple II at S. Omobono, terracotta roof tiles. From Cristofani, ed. 1990, Fig. 5.1.21, 23, 25

3.62 S. Omobono, column shaft casing. From Gjerstad 1960, Fig. 266.3

3.63 S. Omobono, column capital casing. Photo by author

3.64 Paestum. Temple of Athena, column capital. From Mertens 2006, Fig. 385

3.65 Corfu. Temple of Artemis, column capital. Drawing. From Rodenwaldt 1939, Taf. 23 2.66

3.66 Paestum. Temple of Hera I, column capital. Drawing. From Mertens 2006, Fig. 247

3.67 Tarquinia, Monterozzi necropolis. Tomb of the Lionesses, back right corner, detail of column. Photo by author

3.68 S. Omobono. Early fifth century terracotta revetment. From Gjerstad 1960, Fig. 282.3-5

3.69 Ardea. Early fifth century double anthemion revetment. From Andrén 1939, Pl. 136.478

3.70 S. Omobono, Temples I and II. Plans by Ioppolo. From Various authors 1989
A. Pl. II
B. Pl. IV

3.71 S. Omobono, Temples I and II. Plans by Colonna. From Colonna 1991, Fig. 2 a-b

3.72 Site of S. Omobono. 1977-78 excavation trench, section. Detail with destroyed podium marked. After Pisani Sartorio and Virgili 1979, Fig. 2

3.73 S. Omobono, Temples I and II. Plans with well documented elements in black and hypothetical elements in grey. By author

3.74 S. Omobono, Temple I. terracotta revetments possibly pertaining to central gorgon. From Mertens-Horn 1994, Pl. VIII

3.75 Roof of Temple I at S. Omobono. Reconstruction of central pediment. From Mura Sommella 2000, Fig. 11

3.76 Temple II at S. Omobono, terracotta sima revetment with meander. From Mura Sommella 1977, Fig. 11

3.77 Velletri. Temple at Ss. Stimmate, sphinx acroterion. From Fortunate 1986, Figs. 13 and 15

3.78 Roof of Temples at S. Omobono. Detail of ridgepole sculpture. Photo by author

3.79 Temple II at S. Omobono, unidentified ridgepole sculpture. Drawing. From Mura Sommella 1977, Fig. 31

3.80 Site of S. Omobono. Spur of Vicus Iugarius to east of Twin Temple platform. View from north. Photo by author

3.81 Site of S. Omobono. Remains of late-Republican and Imperial temples on platform. View from southwest. Photo by author

3.82 Site of S. Omobono. Plan of excavated platform walls. From Colini 2000, Pl. V

3.83 Tarquinia. Ara della Regina. Plan. From Colonna 2006, VIII.34

3.84 Votive urns
A. from Veii. From Staccioli, Pl. I
B. From Velletri. Photo by author

3.85 Fourth century Votive urn. From Staccioli, Pl. 12

3.86 Larisa on the Hermos. Revetments of racing charioteers. Drawings. From Åkerström 1966, Taf. 25

3.87 Larisa on the Hermos. Revetments of banqueting. Drawings. From Åkerström 1966, Taf. 29

3.88 Veii. Temple of Apollo, ridgepole sculpture of Apollo. Photo by author

3.89 Veii. Temple of Apollo, ridgepole sculptures: Left, Hercules; Right, Latona carrying infant. From Torelli and Moretti Sgubini 2008, P. 61

3.90 Attic and Ionian kylices from around Temple II at S. Omobono. From Gjerstad 1960, Fig. 277

**Chapter 4**. The Temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus on the Capitoline

4.1 Capitoline Temple. Reconstruction of workers building the foundations. From Albertoni, et al. 2008, Fig. 10

4.2 Capitoline Temple. Section of east foundation wall, foundation trench and paving level. From Albertoni, et al. 2008, fig. 21

4. 3 Capitoline Temple excavations. At bottom, sarcophagus; at top, 7-6th c. grave. From Danti 2001, Fig. 13

4.4 Capitoline Temple. Pozzo, side view. From Albertoni, *et al.* 2008, Fig. 68

4.5 Capitoline Temple. Terracotta acroteria. From Albertoni, *et al.* 2008, Fig. 8

4.6 Capitoline Temple. Drawing of terracotta revetments with location of remains outlined in dotted line. Drawing by author after Albertoni, *et al.* 2008, Fig. 9 and Mura Sommella 2000b, Fig. 12

4.7 Capitoline Temple. Plan of superstructure and foundations. After Gjerstad 1953-1973 Vol. III, Fig. 116

4.8 Capitoline Temple. Elevation of foundations and podium walls. From Danti 2001, Fig. 26

4.9 Capitoline Temple. Hackens' walls, plan. From Hackens 1962, Fig. 2

4.10 Capitoline Temple. Hackens' walls, elevation from east of C-D. From Hackens 1962, Fig. 4

4.11 Capitoline Temple. Pietrangeli's plan with central transverse wall. From Pietrangeli, C. ed. 1976, p. 125

4.12 Capitoline Temple. Plan of foundation walls with segments marked. After Mura Sommella 2000b, Fig. 5 and Danti 2001, Fig. 1

4.13 Capitoline Temple. East face of east wall (wall VI) from North. Photo by author

4.14 Capitoline Temple. Plan of foundation segments with hypothesized walls numbered and in grey. After Mura Sommella 2000b, Fig. 5 and Danti 2001, Fig. 1

4.15 Capitoline Temple. Plan of foundations. From Jordan 1885, T I zu S. 66 ff

4.16 Capitoline Temple. Plan of foundations. From Cifani 2008. Fig.70

4.17 Capitoline Temple. Composite of plan of foundations. After Jordan 1885, p. 66ss and this volume, Fig. 4.12

4.18 Capitoline Temple. Plan of foundations and Palazzo Caffarelli. From Danti 2001, Fig. 1

4.19 Capitoline Temple. Plan of foundations with trenches between foundation walls in pink. After Mura Sommella 2000b, Fig. 5 and Danti 2001, Fig. 1

4.20 Capitoline Temple. Muro Romano, view of east face. Photo by author

4.21 Capitoline Temple. Muro Romano, elevation of east face during excavation. From Albertoni, *et al.* 2008, Fig. 13

4.22 Capitoline Temple. Wall VI from southeast. Photo of author by Erik Gustafson

4.23 Scale comparison of four colossal Italic buildings
a. Capitoline Temple. Foundation plan. This volume, Fig. 14
b. Murlo, Upper building. plan. From Damgaard-Andersen 1998, Plan 3, 19.2
c. Montetosto complex. Plan. From Damgaard-Andersen 1998, Plan 4, 18.1
d. Centocamere. Plan. From Turfa 2002, Fig. 4

4.24 Capitoline Temple. Scale drawing of anthemion fragments. From Mura Sommella 2000a, Fig. 27

4.25 Capitoline Temple. Reconstruction of revetments. From Mura Sommella 2000b, Fig. 12

4.26 Satricum, Temple II. Reconstructed frieze plaque. From Andrén 1940, Pl. 150.513

4.27 Capitoline Temple. Plan of foundations and superstructure. From Mura Sommella 2000a, Fig. 26

4.28 Ara della Regina. Plan of 4th c. building. From Bonghi Jovino 1997, Fig. 17

4.29 Temple of Apollo at Didyma. Plan of naos with Measurements. From Wiegand 1941, Z. 146

4.30 Capitoline Temple. Plan by Gabriele Cifani. From Cifani 2008, Fig. 85

4.31 a. Ara della Regina. Plan of foundations with area of archaic foundations shaded. After Colonna 2006, VIII.34
b. Murlo, Upper building, plan. From Damgaard-Andersen 1998, Plan 3, 19.2

4.32 Comparison of truss and post-and-lintel roofs. After Hodge 1960, Fig. 10

4.33 Temple of Poseidon. Post-and-lintel roof. From Hodge 1960, Fig. 2

4.34 Temple of Demeter at Gaggera. Roof. From Hodge 1960, Fig. 8

4.35 Comparison of Parthenon with Temple of Artemis (Ephesus), Temple of Hera (Samos), Temple GT (Selinus), Temple of Zeus (Acragas), Temple of Zeus (Athens). After Davies 2006, Fig. 1

4.36 Capitoline Temple. Axonometric reconstruction. From Stamper 2005, Fig. 18

4.37 Capitoline Temple. Composite of Stamper's temple plan and Mura Sommella's foundations. After Stamper 2005, Fig. 16 and this volume, Fig. 4.14

4.38 Capitoline Temple. Foundation plan. From Stamper 2005, Fig. 15

4.39 Capitoline Temple. Excavation between walls I and II. Photo by author

4.40 Capitoline Temple. Excavation south of transverse wall IX. Photo by author

4.41 Capitoline Temple. East face of wall I. Photo by author

4.42 Capitoline Temple. Muro Romano, west face. Photo by author
Area I. partially destroyed / deconstructed section of wall
Area II. west face of wall, fully intact and undisturbed

4.43 Capitoline Temple. Excavation of transverse wall XI. From Danti 2001, Fig. 5

4.44 Capitoline Temple. Elevation of foundations. From Jordan 1885, T II zu S. 66 ff

4.45 Capitoline Temple. Northwest corner. Photos by author

4.46 Capitoline Temple. Composite of Stamper's temple plan and Mura Sommella's foundations. Excess foundation in pink After Stamper 2005, Fig. 16 and this volume, Fig. 4.14

4.47 Capitoline Temple. Plan of superstructure with measurements. After Mura Sommella 2000a, Fig. 26

4.48 a. Capitoline Temple. Plan of foundations and superstructure. After Mura Sommella 2000a, Fig. 26
b. Temple of Hera at Samos, plan of foundations and Superstructure. From Buschor 1930, Z. 1

4.49 Capitoline Temple. Two plans of cellas. By author

4.50 Capitoline Temple. Tuff pozzo at northeast corner of Palazzo Caffarelli. From Cifani 2008, Fig. 79

4.51 Capitoline Temple. Three plans of rear rooms. By author

4.52 Capitoline Temple. Reconstruction, view from above. From Albertoni, *et al.* 2008, Fig. 6

4.53 Scale comparison of Capitoline Temple with oikos temples at (a) Veii, (b) Tarquinia, (c) Gabii, and (d) Satricum. By author

4.54 Veii, Piazza d'Armi. Oikos temple
a. Plan. From Colonna, ed. 1985, Fig. 2.0
b. fictile decoration. From Colonna, ed. 1985, Fig. 2.4 2

4.55 Rome, S. Omobono. Elevation of temple ca. 580-570. From Mura Sommella 2000a, Fig. 1

4.56 Satricum, Temple I. Plan. After De Waele, J. A. K. E. 1981, Foglie 4 & 7

4.57 Scale comparison of Capitoline Temple with (a) Satricum, Temple I and (b) S. Omobono, Temple II. By author

4.58 Ara della Regina. Plan of foundations with area of archaic foundations shaded. After Colonna 2006, VIII.34

4.59 Ara della Regina. View of south foundations from southeast. Photo by author

4.60 Ara della Regina. View of north foundations from northeast corner. Photo by author

4.61 Scale comparison of Capitoline Temple and Ara della Regina. By author

4.62 a. Comparison of Geometric and archaic Temples of Hera at Samos. After Buschor 1930, Beilage XXVII
b. Comparison of Temple F and Temple G at Selinunte. After Mertens 2006, Figs. 393 and 401

4.63 Four examples of correlations between foundation and superstructure in Central Italic Temples (not to scale). By author
a. Orvieto. After Colonna 2006,Fig. VIII.43
b. Tarquinia, Ara della Regina. After Colonna 1985, Fig. 4.4
c. Ardea, Colle della Noce. After Di Mario 2007, Fig. 7
d. Lanuvium. After Galieti 1928, Fig. 1

4.64 Four examples of correlations between foundation and superstructure in Greek Temples (not to scale). By author
a. Assos. After Bacon 1902, Pl. 141

b. Corinth, Temple of Apollo. After Fowler, *et al.* 1932 Vol. I, Pl. V
c. Corfu, Temple of Artemis. After Rodenwaldt 1939, Taf. 22
d. Delphi, Temple of Apollo. After Courby 1931, Pl. III

4.65 Capitoline Temple. Plan of foundations and superstructure. By author

4.66 Example of columen relief from Pyrgi, Temple B. After Colonna 1985, Fig. 7.1H

4.67 Satricum, Temple I. Anthemion relief. From Andrén 1940, Pl. 139.488

4.68 Naxos, Temple of Aphrodite. Sima fragment. From Mertens 2006, Fig. 210

4.69 Scale comparison of temples in Italy with triple cellas, deep porches and multiple colonnades. By author

4.70 Six examples of floral revetments from temples in Central Italy. By author

4.71 Talamone Temple, Pediment. From Colonna 2006, Fig. VIII.45

**Chapter 5**. Conclusions: the changing city and its architecture

5.1 Timeline of construction in archaic Rome. By author

**Appendix**

6.1 Cloaca Maxima. View under Forum from east. Photo by author

6.2 Reconstruction of Cloaca Maxima and Vicus Tuscus with Measurements. By author

6.3 Door to Cloaca Maxima below Basilica Julia. Photo by author

6.4 Door to Cloaca Maxima below Basilica Julia, View from Inside Cloaca with meter stick. Photo by author

6.5 Cloaca Maxima. Juncture of lapis gabinus and cappellaccio Masonries with meter stick. Photo by author

# Chapter 1

## An Introduction to public architecture in archaic Rome

As a riposte to Mark Antony's preference for Alexandria, Octavian is said to have stressed his own favor for Rome, acclaiming it the home of the empire and recreating it through the most lavish building program the city had yet seen.[1] It took little time for chroniclers to acclaim his transformation of the city, and from antiquity to the present, students of history and architecture have learned that it was Augustus who crafted a Roman cityscape befitting the empire's capital. Monuments around and within the *urbs* attest to the transformation that Augustus made possible, and few would argue that his vision did not fundamentally change the city; but below the marble coating, before Augustus' rule, Rome was already a bustling metropolis. Caesar's Forum, Pompey's Theater, Sulla's touch on the Capitoline, and other, earlier Republican monuments have become popular topics of debate, and more and more, scholars argue that Romans created lavish monuments in the centuries before the Common Era. Still, in a majority of studies, the buildings and civic spaces that lay at the foundation of Rome's urban image remain out of sight. With the exception of Italian archaeologists and art historians, most scholars brush past Romans' early architectural achievements, and consequently the city has been given a half-history that begins only when the action is already nearing climax. Yet it is only by looking to Rome's early landscape that one can trace the roots

[1] Cass. Dio, 51.10-22; Suet. *Aug.*, 28-31. The modern bibliography is long, but famously: P. Zanker 1990.

of the buildings and topography of the late-Republic and Empire, and it is in the city's earliest years that one finds evidence to contemplate fundamental questions about Roman architecture: why did the Forum become the Forum? Did Romans build a colossal temple in the sixth century and did it influence later architects? How did Rome come to be a powerful enough city-state to dream of overtaking Italy or the Mediterranean?

Responses to these questions lie in the changing landscape of Rome between 650 and 450 BCE. From the 1950s to the 1970s, Einar Gjerstad famously examined remains from this period and made startling claims of grand temples and civic buildings dotting the archaic landscape. Although his volumes on *Early Rome* have endured scrutiny for their problematic dating mechanism, they attests the author's unflinching determination to record and interpret the broad material record of the early city, a method and fascination that he shared with several of his contemporaries, including Boëthius, Welin, Lyngby, Hanell and others.[2] In the years since, archaeologists have uncovered more ruins that attest to a city unlike the humble township that many imagined for early Rome. In the wake of these excavations, Italian archaeologists and a small but influential international group of Etruscologists and Hellenists have highlighted and extrapolated from the new finds. One scholar, Gabriele Cifani, has produced a compendium of early Rome's buildings, but this serves largely as a catalogue and a study of the tectonics of

[2] Raflaub notes that Gjerstad looked to Hanell for his dating scheme: K. Hanell 1967. Also, E. Welin 1953;A. Boethius 1967; A. Boëthius*, et al.* 1994; H. Lyngby 1939; H. Lyngby 1954.

stone construction, not architectural design or the art (primarily sculpture) that adorned these buildings. A few scholars, especially Andrea Carandini, have sought in part to address early monuments in relation to Rome's later architectural history, but their work—and its primary goal of linking archaeology to the literary tradition—has received harsh criticism. Other scholars, including Anna Mura Sommella, Nancy Winter, Ingrid Edlund-Berry and Madeleine Mertens Horn, have traced the roots of individual architectural features of early Roman buildings. Their work finds its way into studies of early Italy, but less frequently into scholarship on later Roman art and architecture. Outside of these scholars, few non-Italian archaeologists or art historians address early Roman architecture. The new excavations and studies therefore do not often make it into English, French or German scholarship, whose historiography is steeped in philology and a (perhaps prudent) distrust of the literary record of early Rome. Archaeologists and art historians outside of Italy have therefore been reluctant to extrapolate too heavily from the material remains, and so, the early monuments have become the territory of literary historians. In fact, most studies of Rome's early urban landscape have been assembled by textual scholars, and in most of their studies, material remains (understandably) serve debates over literature: art and architecture are left without serious consideration.[3] The history of the architecture and topography of Rome

[3] Some of the most prominent and recent studies include R. R. Holloway 1994; T. Cornell 1995; C. J. Smith 1996; G. Forsythe 2005. While Holloway and Smith do highlight art and architecture, they have a broader concern for Rome as part of Latium. An exception is T. P. Wiseman 2008. I do not count among these A. Boëthius*, et al.* 1994, as his study was a self professed look at early Central Italy (Etruria and Rome, as he called it), *not* the architectural history of early Rome in particular.

therefore lingers without its introduction and the history of early Rome, often distrusted for its dependence on biased sources written nearly a half millennium later, merits a fresh art historical perspective. In this dissertation I examine the public architecture of Rome between 650 and 450 with a twofold purpose. I seek to establish what architecture and its component parts can reveal about the people of archaic Rome and their interaction with cultures outside of the city and the Italic Peninsula. I also assess the long-overlooked role that archaic Rome played in the greater history of Roman architecture and urban design.

**Public (and private) architecture in archaic Rome**

Buried beneath the monuments of the Empire and Republic, much of the archaic city is still unknown; yet a vast and growing number of remains reveals a city rich in domestic and public architecture. In this study I consider monuments of a more public nature. In part the choice to restrict the scope is due to the size of the project, but the decision is also founded in the state of the archaeology. Until recently scant domestic architecture from archaic Rome had been uncovered. While this has changed with the investigations of the northern Palatine, these areas are still being excavated and studied and are therefore not fully published; new research independent of the ongoing excavations would be unfeasible. I have consequently chosen to focus on public monuments whose remains are substantial enough to offer a basis of study. The definition of "public space" is not easy to determine for antiquity, and the debate over

divisions between public and private life has a long bibliography; for the purposes of this study, I identify public spaces and public buildings as those that have a demonstrably primary role of a religious, governmental, or otherwise civic nature. Substantial remains of this sort of architecture exist largely in three locations in Rome: the area that would become the Forum Romanum, the site of the modern church of S. Omobono and the surroundings of the Capitoline Temple. These places are the focus of the three chapters of this dissertation. Construction in archaic Rome is not, however, confined to these areas and to restrict study entirely to these sites would do a disservice to the image of the early city. In some areas, like the south slope of the Palatine and on the Esquiline, limited remains present less fodder for study, but they do reveal the existence of temples and other buildings; their presence is therefore of some import, and as a background for the body of this study, a brief introduction to these monuments is essential.

*Burials*

In the late seventh century, perhaps in response to frequent flooding or as part of a reclamation of adjacent land for civic use, Romans stopped burying their dead at the base of the Velia and Capitoline, on the eastern and western edges of what would be the Roman Forum.[4] At the same time burials increase on the Esquiline and Quirinal Hills as part of a possible relocation of the city's necropoleis; these new burials are the primary

[4] For more on the relocation of the graves, see Chapter 1. For discussion of "Romans" see this chapter, "writing 'unwritten' Rome"

evidence for the culture of the dead during the archaic period at Rome and witness the start of a shift in Rome's landscape and wealth. The earliest remains of the new tombs date to ca. 625, and they persist through the middle of the fifth century when evidence for burials throughout Rome ebbs.[5] The majority of the burials on both hills are small cremation and inhumation *fossa* graves (usually partially revetted in rough tuff slabs) with burial deposits of local character, including fibulae, small bronze figures, impasto vases and in exceptionally wealthy cases, bronze pectorals, cistas, jewelry and spears.[6] These materials and the manner of burial attest to local, Central Italic burial practices, but the graves also include Corinthian vases and other foreign goods, suggesting that Rome was not a totally insular city, cut off from the Mediterranean world. The suggestion is not surprising, and foreign goods are by no means abnormal for archaic Central Italy; rather, they demonstrate that the archaic peoples of Rome, like their neighbors from southern Latium to the Po Valley, had an interest in trade and foreign luxury goods.

Two exceptional examples from the graves at Rome reveal that in some cases, burial goods and even the people buried *were* exceptional for Central Italy. In a grave (Esquiline tomb 125) dating to the late seventh century, archaeologists found a

[5] The poor treatment of undecorated tombs in the archaeological record has lead many to see a lack of necropoleis in Rome and throughout Latium after ca. 450; this concern is beyond the scope of this work, but for a synthesis of arguments on the topic: G. Colonna 1977b; M. Albertoni 1983; C. Ampolo 1984; G. Colonna 1996; F. Zevi 1996; C. Barbato 2003; M. Barbera 2005. I disagree with Colonna's conclusion (which Ampolo and others follow) that the burial goods disappear because of sumptuary laws; rather, it is possible that due to the sporadic nature of excavations on the Esquiline and Quirinal, many graves have not been found.

[6] G. Pinza 1914; E. Gjerstad 1953-1973, III.162-279 with references. Most of these have been lost in the storerooms of Rome, and it is at present impossible to know the contents of many individual graves.

Corinthian (or Corinthianizing?) olpe decorated with a scale pattern around the neck and upper body, horizontal stripes around the body and triangles along the base (Fig. 1.1).[7] Inscribed below the lowest stripe is the Greek word KTEKTOY. Since the inscription postdates the manufacture of the vessel (it cuts the outer slip) scholars contend that it was made by the purchaser of the object. The act of inscribing the vessel is not unusual, rather it is the character of the inscription that provokes speculation: the use of E (ε) and OY (ου) beside each other is particular to an East Greek alphabet, and this has lead scholars to suggest that the vase is evidence of a Rhodian man, deceased and buried in Rome.[8] The presence of such a distant culture not just stopping briefly but perhaps living in and partaking in the burial culture of Rome is the first of many similar ties to the eastern Mediterranean that will be explored in this study. Another striking find comes from an early fifth century burial for which the deceased's remains were placed in a rectangular cinerary urn with a pitched cover; this urn was in turn placed in a larger finely carved *peperino* tuff chest and sunk into the ground.[9] The peperino chest is in itself remarkable for the fact that the stone is only available in the Alban hills and is otherwise not well-known in the archaeological record of archaic Rome (Fig. 1.2). It indicates that for some special burials in the archaic period Romans were wealthy enough and had enough ties to import and work (or have worked) stone from outside their city. But the

[7] E. Gjerstad 1953-1973, II.261.
[8] G. Colonna 1964, 7. Newer approaches to such objects and inscriptions caution restraint. It is conceivable that a Rhodian man inscriped the vessel before selling it again himself. It remains unclear, and this is precisely why I have chosen to focus on architecture in this dissertation.
[9] On the tomb and the urn: G. Pinza 1914, 136; C. Ampolo 1973, 97, 196; G. Colonna 1977b, 139-146.

large chest is often overlooked for its exceptional contents. The smaller urn inside it, measuring 61 x 38 x 32 cm, is a finely carved and sumptuously painted chest of Parian marble (Fig. 1.3).[10] It is the only known example of marble from the Aegean island used in such a capacity in the entirety of Central Italy, save a fragment from a similar chest at Caere.[11] The presence at Rome of such a lavish burial good, matched only at one of Central Italy's greatest cities speaks of significant ties to the outside world. In fact, the only comparanda for the object elsewhere in the Western Mediterranean come from Spina in northeast Italy, Caere and Cumae, leading scholars to suggest they all come from the same Parian workshop or at least that craftsmen from Italy were importing the fine stone from the Aegean. The vase and urn suggest two different kinds of intercultural exchange. The vase may have been inscribed by a foreigner who came to Rome or by a person who grew up in Rome speaking Greek and writing it with an eastern alphabet; it therefore may not directly indicate contact between Romans and first-generation immigrants. It does, however, indicate that Rome was a city that included people of different cultures, and while this dissertation focuses on foreign culture brought to Rome from the outside, this reveals that sometimes those outside cultures remained in Rome, perhaps even for generations. The urn, on the other hand, suggests a more direct interconnection between Rome and the outside world.

[10] Most of the painting is now lost. On dimensions, context, type of marble and comparanda a Spina: C. Ampolo 1973, 196-197; for more on the chest, its date and comparanda elsewhere G. Colonna 1977b, 139-146.
[11] G. Colonna 1977b, 145-146.

*Small finds from religious buildings*

Dotting the hills of Rome from the Esquiline to the Capitoline, some of the largest and most exquisitely decorated examples of public monuments in archaic Rome are temples and other religious buildings. Sanctuaries occupy a substantial portion of this study, but due to accidents of discovery, of history and of the development of the city in the late-nineteenth and twentieth centuries, the only substantial, excavated remains for temples are on the Capitoline, in the Forum and along the Tiber. The luck of preservation should not, however, dictate one's impression of the expansiveness of the city in the archaic period or of the wealth and distribution of religious architecture. Remains of substantial temples on the Esquiline, in several locations on the Palatine and perhaps the Velia suggest that by the end of the archaic period, major religious buildings occupied not just the area from the River to the Capitoline and Forum, but all of the hills and valleys; a brief overview of remains from these locations is an essential backdrop for the body of this dissertation (Fig. 1.4). Most of the remains date to the end of the sixth and beginning of the fifth centuries, suggesting that toward the end of the archaic period, in unison with most of Italy and the northern Mediterranean, there was a burst in temple construction at Rome.

During the excavation of tombs on the Esquiline, Rodolfo Lanciani unearthed a two-thirds life size sculpture of an Amazon slain in battle (Fig. 1.5).[12] Surprisingly,

[12] The identity had been debated, but recently Patricia Lulof has addressed the concerns in detail: P. S. Lulof 2007, 7-10 with references. The piece was found in the fill below the

although he took pains to enumerate stratigraphic contexts of graves and their goods, he omitted any details of the statue's context. In a recent analysis of the sculpture and its historiography, Patricia Lulof has pieced together its probable incorporation into a fill below the first century Horti of Maecenas, and suggests it was originally an acroterion for a temple of the late sixth or very early fifth centuries.[13] The piece has long been regarded as a masterwork of archaic sculpture: a fallen Amazon lies on her right side, still holding her shield aloft; the wound below her left breast issues blood down her torso, and a broken piece of terracotta joining her right calf reveals that another figure, reconstructed as her attacker, hovered over her perhaps still driving a spear into his victim (Fig. 1.6). Scholars note that the painting and sculptural qualities of the statue are a tour de force, and have long suggested a Greek craftsman was behind the execution. Lulof's detailed study of the manufacture confirms the hypothesis.[14] She notes that the sculptor created the body of the Amazon using three layers of clay: a thick underbody to generate the basic shape, a smoother, refined coating to give detail to the anatomy of the figure, and a fine slip on top for paint. The technique is absent in Central Italic sculpture, but prominent in Greek terracotta figures, for example, at Paestum. Lulof adds, however, that only the torso of the figure is constructed with this technique, and a few parts of the Amazon are, instead, constructed using only one layer of clay; apart from the Roman Amazon, the combination of both techniques in terracotta sculpture is found *only* on

---

gardens of Micenas and therefore lacks an original context; it could conceivably be a spoil from Sicily brought to Rome in the Republic. For the purpose of this dissertation, I follow the scholarly record, which unanimously suggests it belongs to archaic Rome

[13] P. S. Lulof 2007, 22.

[14] P. S. Lulof 2007, 21-25 cf. G. Colonna 1977b, 163-164.

Sicily. What is more, in a study of architectural sculture from around Rome, the Amazon is the only piece whose material is not terracotta made from local clay. In fact, it is made of mudstone, a material popular in Sicily and Corinth.[15] The unmistakable implication is that a Sicilian terracotta master was brought to Rome or commissioned by a patron in Rome to create this acroterial sculpture and probably a vast program for a precious temple on the Esquiline. The sculpture is all that remains of the temple, and so the building remains largely an enigma, but along with fragments from the other hills, it begins to reveal something of archaic Rome's religious architecture.

Nearby, on the Velia, scholars uncovered remains of a column casing and a floral revetment both of which date to the early fifth century (Fig. 1.7).[16] Most have suggested that the remains belong to a temple, and while this is possible, these kinds of terracottas were used on houses and other non-religious buildings during the archaic period as well; the function of this building is therefore in doubt. In any case, the column casing is an extraordinary find; measuring about one-half the size of a casing from S. Omobono, it is one of just two such finds from Rome and the entirety of Central Italy.[17] Though scanty, the terracottas indicate a decorated building on the hill that once connected the Palatine to the Esquiline.

Evidence from the Palatine that dates between ca. 540 and 475 reveals four substantial buildings, three of which had religious functions. During excavations of the

[15] N. A. Winter*, et al.* 2009, 14
[16] E. Gjerstad 1953-1973, III.133-135.
[17] H. Damgaard Andersen 1998, 82. This is not to say it is one of just two terracotta column casings made in early Central Italy.

terracing walls in front of the later temples of Magna Mater and Victoria, archaeologists found an antefix head of a female or maenad; it is the only testimony of a building in the surrounding area, and its style dates to the very end of the sixth century. Given its similarities to other antefixes from temples in Rome and elsewhere, some claim that it must have belonged to a nearby temple, but recent trends in scholarship suggest it need not have been a religious building; in some cases in early Central Italy, houses and temples employed similar antefixes (Fig. 1.8).[18] While excavating the area around the House of Augustus, Livia and the precincts of Magna Mater and Victoria, archaeologists found two other sets of terracottas. Underneath and behind a structure identified as the Temple of Victoria Virgo, they discovered several walls in *cappellaccio* that they suggest pertain to a religious building (Fig. 1.9).[19] The suggestion finds support in the presence of three favissae filled with votives, and on top of the walls, in what appears to be a layer of destruction, three antefixes with the head of Juno Sospita that date to the early fifth century (Fig. 1.10).[20] Though the remains of the foundations (just two perpendicular walls) are insufficient for reconstructing a plan for the structure, the evidence of ritual pits, a building and antefixes for a roof are clear indication of a religious structure. Not far from this excavation, under the house of Livia were revetments of the Veii–Rome–

[18] E. Gjerstad 1953-1973, III.88 with references. The use of rich terracotta decoration on domestic architecture became particularly apparent in the wake of excavations at Acquarossa.
[19] P. Pensabene*, et al.* 1993, 23-24; P. Pensabene 1998, 85-88.
[20] P. Pensabene 1980, 75; P. Pensabene*, et al.* 1993, 23-24; P. Pensabene 1998, 85-86. Also associated with this building is a terracotta ring of contested function. It was first called a column base, but since has been characterized as a cover for a ritual well.

Velletri type, including riders racing in two directions and a banquet scene (Fig. 1.11).[21] The style of relief is much earlier than the Juno antefixes, and suggests a separate religious structure in the area dating between ca. 540 and 520.[22] Nothing more of this building has been found. At the opposite corner of the Palatine, close to the later Arch of Constantine, excavators uncovered remains of a street and a wall in cappellaccio; the close proximity of the wall to earlier sacrificial remains suggests to some that a sacred precinct already in existence by the early sixth century gained more substantial architectural elaboration near the end of the archaic period (Fig. 1.12).[23]

At present a more thorough picture of any of these buildings is elusive, but the dimensions of the terracottas, in many cases comparable to elements from considerable buildings like the Temple of Castor in Rome or Temple at Ss. Stimmate in Velletri, suggests that the structures were sizeable and would have been important both for religious purposes and as part of the city's image. The terracottas also reveal something more of the culture of Rome in the late archaic period. Like burial goods from the Esquiline, they suggest extensive mixing of foreign and local cultures in the city: while the terracottas from the Palatine demonstrate that Romans often maintained local or neighboring stylistic and iconographic trends, the Esquiline Amazon reveals that Romans were aware of and interested in art from the wider Mediterranean, attentive enough even to commission work from a sculptor otherwise unattested in the Italic Peninsula.

---

[21] E. Gjerstad 1953-1973, III.79. For more on this roof type, see Chapter 2.
[22] For the date of this revetment type, see chapter 3.
[23] S. Zeggio 2005, 63-76; S. Zeggio 2006, 63-66.

*Domestic and infrastructural architecture*

In addition to traces of sacred architecture, all across the Palatine archaeologists have found private and infrastructural works that attest to the domestic, human needs of inhabitants of the city. Thus far, the Palatine is the only hill to give up remains of this nature, but recent excavations of Orientalizing-era habitation around and below the archaic Temple of Jupiter on the Capitoline suggests that were such exploration undertaken in other parts of the archaic city—on the Velia, the Esquiline and Quirinal—similar domestic architecture and infrastructure could be uncovered.

On the southwest slope of the Palatine around the later temple of Victoria, archaeologists unearthed three cisterns and what appears to be a silo (Figs. 1.13–1.14). The three cisterns are all constructed in a technique common in Etruria and Latium from the Orientalizing period onward: a thick impermeable layer of clay is sandwiched between two concentric stone walls, the inner invariably of cappellaccio blocks and the outer of either bedrock or cappellaccio ashlars.[24] Unfortunately two of the cisterns are not precisely datable, but for the largest cistern, near the eighth century Palatine huts, archaeologists found two relatively undamaged mid-sixth-century vases in the clay lining; scholars suggest the ceramics were a ritual offering at the end of construction and date the cistern to the late sixth century.[25] Based on a similarity of construction, they also suggest the other cisterns in the area must date to the same period, but this is uncertain.

[24] E. Gjerstad 1953-1973.
[25] E. Gjerstad 1953-1973. The date has been contested: see below.

Recent excavations at the Forum of Caesar uncovered a cistern constructed in the same manner, and it dates to the second century BCE.[26] Whatever the dates of the other two, at least one cistern seems to be archaic. It was built into the bedrock at the very edge of the hill just north of what appear to be archaic retaining walls. Remains of a few courses of these walls exist beside the cistern and around the southwest corner of the hill and indicate an effort to both reinforce the hill and provide some degree of fortification.[27] Further to the east, below the Domus Augustana, archaeologists found a system of storage channels, comprising collection cisterns and tunnels dug out of the bedrock (Fig. 1.15). Gjerstad is the only archaeologist to have seen a few ceramic fragments from layers of hut habitation that abut the top of one cistern; he says these finds date the entire network (save one corbelled cistern) to the late sixth century, but he did not publish the finds and does not give any description of them or the hut level, and so his date is hard to confirm.[28] A similar cistern below the Palazzo dei Conservatori on the

[26] The excavations were carried out by Alessandro Delfino and are as yet unpublished. Gabriele Cifani has suggested that all of the cisterns on the Palatine date to the late sixth century based on similar dimensions and heights of the cappellaccio blocks, but in fact, in two of the cisterns the blocks are ca. 45 cm tall and in the other, ca. 24 cm tall. G. Cifani 2008, 156-162; for the correct measurements: E. Gjerstad 1953-1973. Neither of these measurements match the blocks of the Capitoline Temple or the Temple of Castor (ca. 29-30 cm tall), and in fact there is enormous and unsystematic variation in the dimensions of cappellaccio blocks used in Rome between the early sixth and late fifth centuries.

[27] Cifani suggests this includes large substructures at the side of the Temple of Victoria, but those probably date to the late fifth or fourth century: P. Pensabene and S. Falzone 2001, 97-119; G. Cifani 2008, 164-165.

[28] The image accompanying the description as well as Gjerstad's text indicates that there is a break in excavation between the huts and the cistern's top. It is unclear if the finds come from the stratum adjacent to the cistern or from around the huts: E. Gjerstad 1953-1973, III.104-121. Even Cifani is skeptical about the date: G. Cifani 2008, 154-156.

Capitoline, is equally vast, but is equally difficult to date.[29] Thus, the number of archaic cisterns on the Palatine and their architectural complexity is unclear; it seems likely, though, that for a community that occupied the entire hill, a substantial volume of water would be necessary; the remaining cistern that dates firmly to the sixth century gives some idea of how early inhabitants of the city collected the necessary provision.

Some of the most important finds from archaic Rome have been unearthed during the ongoing excavation of the north Palatine slope in an area between the later Arch of Titus and Atrium Vestae.[30] Archaeologists reconstruct remains of stone walls throughout the excavated area as houses, gardens, roads and other domestic buildings, and although domestic architecture is outside the scope of this study, the grandeur of the finds (and of the archaeologists claims) warrants a brief examination. Throughout the area archaeologists found cappellaccio walls, beaten-earth floors, ovens, hearths and remains of infant burials dating from the early sixth to early fifth centuries. Those working at the site reconstruct the walls as part of several houses: four large atrium-style houses that were partially supplanted by a larger, seemingly palatial house, and an accompanying sacred area that joined this larger "palace" with the Atrium Vestae / Regia complex (Fig. 1.16-1.17).[31] Andrea Carandini has led the charge to nominate the westernmost house as the home of Ancus Marcius; he suggests that Tarquinius Priscus

[29] E. Gjerstad 1953-1973, III.209-212.
[30] A. Carandini 1986; A. Carandini 1990; A. Carandini*, et al.* 1995 [2000]; N. Arvanitis 2004; A. Carandini 2004; D. Filippi 2004a; D. Filippi 2004b.
[31] A. Carandini*, et al.* 1995 [2000], 73-86; D. Filippi 2004a; D. Filippi 2004b.

transformed that house into the Domus Regis Sacrorum and built a new, larger house to the east, and while Servius Tullius expanded the Domus Regis Sacrorum and the Lucus Vestae (beside the Atrium), Tarquinius Superbus supplanted two of the earlier atrium-style houses with his own enormous palace.[32] These interpretations, as well as the dating mechanism for the excavations, have come under close scrutiny. As to the dates, scholars contend that many of the finds date nearly a half century later than archaeologists on site suggest, and discrepancies in the stratification sequence have indicated to some that dates for the excavation are off by as much as a century.[33] Others have characterized the architectural reconstructions and their ascription to the kings as baseless; Peter Wiseman, who accepts the reconstruction of one house, Domus 3, illustrates that many of the walls excavated from other "houses" are separated by tens of meters, leading to the stark realization that in the so-called "House of Tarquinius," actual remains constitute just 5% of the hypothetical reconstruction (Fig. 1.18).[34] One problem for understanding the remains is that the final publication is still in the making. Yet Domus 3 has seen final publication, and although it retains the most walls of any of the houses, the atrium-style plan is still hard to accept. Walls seem to be connected to beaten earth floors that conjoin one abode, but so much of the house was covered with later buildings that the alae, tablinum and in fact, the whole of the atrium concept are

[32] A. Carandini*, et al.* 1995 [2000], 73-86; D. Filippi 2004a; D. Filippi 2004b.
[33] On problems with the dating mechanism employed by Carandini and archaeologists associated with his excavation (particularly Carafa, Gusberti, Filippi, Arvanitis), see chapter 1 and A. J. Ammerman*, et al.* 2008, 28 n. 79.
[34] T. P. Wiseman 2008, esp. 271, 276-280.

little more than hypothesis (Fig. 1.19).[35] In the end any precise plan or identification of a type of house is highly speculative, and given that no archaeological remains indicate who the occupants were, identifying the owner of each space is even more tendentious.

The excavations are nonetheless extraordinary and revealing. They have brought to light remains of houses (the hearths and domestic ceramics found throughout the excavations makes this much clear) with walls built in stone at the edge of the Roman Forum, leading up the slope of the Palatine Hill. The presence of such large houses in stone, a sure sign of prestige and wealth in Rome from the middle of the sixth century, stands alongside evidence for a growth in substantial temple architecture across the hills and rich burials (including the imported marble cinerary urn) toward the end of the archaic period. The use of stone for domestic architecture, though not widespread in Central Italic culture, is not isolated to Rome. From the mid sixth century inhabitants of San Giovenale, Castel di Decima and Marzabotto built houses in part out of tuff, and famously architects at Roselle built the *Casa a due vani* with outer walls in stone at the start of the sixth century.[36] The Roman houses fit closely with these as examples of the increase of stone domestic architecture in Central Italy (and in fact around the Mediterranean) toward the close of the archaic period.

---

[35] The excavators name other rooms, such as the room of the materfamilias. This is based on Gros and Torelli's hypotheses for which there is in fact no archaeological evidence: P. Gros and M. Torelli 1988, 36; for reaction against Gros and Torelli: H. Damgaard Andersen 1998, 206.

[36] H. Damgaard Andersen 1998, 86, 93-94 Other examples have been found at Acquarossa, Macchia Grande at Veii and the auditorium site outside Rome. On the auditorium site: A. Carandini*, et al.* 2006.

Overall, remains of domestic architecture, burials and small finds from religious buildings across the city, from the Capitoline in the north to the Quirinal and Esquiline in the east and as far as the southeast slopes of the Palatine reveal a community at Rome that prospered from the start of the sixth through the middle of the fifth centuries. Burial goods demonstrate a growing wealth among individuals that mirrors an increase in larger and more costly domestic architecture. Alongside the private material, remains of religious buildings reveal that civic life was also witnessing a shift toward grandeur, with buildings across the hills taking on a larger scale and rich sculptural decoration. The urban image that these materials suggest is not out of step with that of cities around Central Italy; at the same time, communities from Orvieto to Tarquinia, Veii, Ardea, Satricum, Lanuvium and elsewhere were experiencing growth and were building larger and more heavily decorated temples and houses. The materials at Rome do, however, hint at a city that is exceptional for its interest in lavish, novel materials and styles from outside Italy. Throughout Central Italy, burials included costly foreign objects, but Rome stands as one of just two cities to boast marble cinerary urns from the Aegean amongst its goods. Of the vast trove of terracottas found across Latium and Etruria, Rome is the only city yet known to possess architectural sculpture from outside the Italic Peninsula. The only other cities in Central Italy that can claim similar international ties include Tarquinia, Caere and Satricum, some of the most wealthy and international communities on the Peninsula.

**Writing "Unwritten" Rome**

The history of archaic Rome is fraught with uncertainty. One aim of this dissertation is to use architecture and related materials to elucidate aspects of the history. I do not intend, however, to engage in the argument over who rules Rome during the archaic period or how trustworthy the literary history of early Rome is; in fact it is those debates that have impeded focused study of Rome's early architecture.[37] I hope instead to reconstruct the architectural record apart from those concerns specifically to provide an independent reading that can be reintroduced into the debate. Yet to begin writing on archaic Rome without presupposing rulers or even inhabitants (i.e. the patrons, makers and designers) of the city presents a problem. One can hardly write about a building as an active process without a subject, and while this may seem only a problem of logistics, it is one not without semiotic significance. Without the literary record one is left with an archaeology that reveals no names for any of archaic Rome's inhabitants; a mixed ceramic and inscription record that indicates nearly equal evidence for Latin, Etruscan and Greek (and to a lesser extent, Sabine, Faliscan and other Italic) elements at Rome; and no names for the hills, streets, landmarks or areas of town. In part this can be overcome: referring to a street that existed in the archaic period as "what would become

[37] After reading this dissertation, Albert Ammerman had these words to say: "The story of Demaratus and the 5th king of Rome remains an open question. One needs a four-fold vision like William Blake in order to study early Rome: for example, one eye on the story without much or any reliance on the ancient sources or literary tradition, another eye on the sources but with an awareness of their agendas, limitations and development over time, a third eye on the evolution of the urban fabric as a whole, and a fourth eye on interactions between city-states as open systems." In fact this is precisely the manner in which I approached this material, and cannot thank Ammerman enough for putting that into words.

the Vicus Tuscus" is manageable. Yet when referring to the inhabitants and builders of monuments, verbiage has considerable connotations.

*"The Romans"*

In certain cases, it is imperative that I discuss an architectural or sculpture choice as an active process, and so I must presume a subject; given that I am not defining who ruled archaic Rome, and thus, who the author/chooser—the subject—is, this leads to a semantic and semiotic problem. I have chosen to refer to the creators of Rome's archaic topography as "Romans." I do not intend this as a covert suggestion that Rome was necessarily a free, independent polity; that those who ruled the city in the archaic period were born in Rome; that their culture was tied only to the city of Rome; or even that they saw themselves as being part of a "Roman culture" to the exclusion of any other culture. I use it only as a means of stating that those who made the decisions were people living in the city of Rome. I realize that the inherent significatory power of the word "Roman" carries implications, but any other word (kings, Tarquins, Etruscans, Latins) would do the same.[38] "Roman" is, I believe, the most appropriate and least tendentious, because if one can be comfortable in one supposition it is that people building these monuments were for some time, living in the city of Rome.[39]

[38] On significatory power of language and authorship: e.g. M. Foucault 1984, 105-113.
[39] The use of the word "Roman" as geographical and chronological indicator as opposed to a reference to style and culture is particularly well studied. Scholars tend to agree that it is hard, even impossible to define Roman style and form, and rather concede that unlike

*Literature, archaeology and authorship*

While I do not linger on questions of the literary history of Rome in this dissertation, I do not uniformly abolish references to literary sources from my work.[40] In many cases a brief account of the literature on a building like the Temple of Castor, the Regia or the temples at S. Omobono helps frame the later history of a building. In most cases where I mention an ancient passage or a story that several ancient authors reference, I do so chiefly as an introductory remark, and immediately clarify my stance on the applicability of that passage to conceptions of the building in question. For example, several ancient sources remark on the dedication of the Temple of Saturn, and their word has influenced people's interpretation of the archaeology; in the second chapter of this dissertation I mention these passages and state that while they may accurately record that temple's founding, archaeological evidence does not necessarily support this, and therefore, the literature must be cited with extreme caution. In a few cases, I reference the kings of Rome, especially the Tarquins, to set up the historiography of a building and its popular conception in the late-Republic and Empire, but I then state outright that I believe this history to be problematic or at least in discord with the

---

"Greek," "Assyrian," "Hellenistic" or other terms, it is indicative only that an object was created in a place that can be defined as Roman: O. Brendel 1953, 73; R. Brilliant 2007, 10-11.

[40] To some degree, it is impossible to remove the literary history of Rome completely from this study. Ceramic chronologies have long been implicitly linked to literary chronologies, and much of the dating in this study is linked to ceramic chronology. I have consciously left dates broad in hopes of leaving the reader in a position to interperate widely.

archaeological evidence. In rare cases, chiefly with regard to the reconstruction of the Capitoline Temple, I do use literary sources as evidence for the buildings; in these situations I explain at length why I feel such usage is reasonable. Outside of these exceptions I have left the literature out of this dissertation and any conclusions I make.

In leaving behind the literature and the ascription of buildings to specific rulers, I am also relinquishing the search for an author for each of these buildings; I look to peoples and cultures that influence design and construction, but I do not seek a patron, nor do I use an author to define an object. This is in keeping with a fundamental premise of the study of ethnicity and culture; that is, the object rendered by a creator does not represent that creator.[41] It may be part of a context related to that creator, but the object itself is inherently different from its author and must be contemplated for itself before a relationship with its creator is investigated. This is especially true for a period when it is unclear what role a government had in the conception, patronage, design and execution of a monument. In a period when individual identity is illusive, it is more feasible to trace the aspects of an object to broad cultural, ideological or stylistic roots than to the very hand that wrought it. In other words, while an object may not reveal its creator, it does betray aspects of its *creation*, and it is these aspects that I seek to identify, not by looking at the rulers of Rome, as most studies have done, but by looking at the object. Thus, I do not omit literary evidence or discussion of rulers because of any agenda for a "New Archaeology" or a comprehensive division of material from literary

[41] For example: R. Barthes 1977.

evidence, but instead because it is the precise aim of this project to allow the objects to speak for themselves. In nearly every study of the visual evidence of this period scholars have attempted to reconcile literature and architecture; given the scrutiny that literary evidence of archaic Rome experiences, I believe one should reconstruct each story individually before attempting a combination of the two historical records. This has been done for the literature, and now the art and architecture deserve their turn.

# Chapter 2

## Creating the Forum Romanum:
### The transformation and monumentalization of an artificial urban space

By the fourth century CE the Roman Forum had become a stage for some of the most resplendent buildings in the Mediterranean. From the "Tabularium" in the north to the Basilica of Maxentius on the southern boundary and with vast, opulent complexes like the Imperial Fora on its periphery, it was the beating heart of the capital of a vast empire. Scholars writing on Roman topography and architectural history have long taken the site's early architectural development for granted, confronting late-Republican and Imperial monuments after only a passing introduction to the Forum's origins.[42] The cursory glimpse at the early period usually reports or implies the site's natural state as a morass valley that witnessed modest construction in the eighth to fourth centuries and gradually became the focus of the city. This narrative, however, presents irreconcilable conclusions. First it presumes the unsavory natural condition of the Forum Valley; then, without proposing why, it suggests that Romans focused their community around and within this unstable, inhospitable landscape. What is more, the narrative implies that there was no intention behind the development of the Forum; rather, a slow unplanned accretion of monuments passively attracted more projects until the space held a host of

[42] E.g. F. E. Brown 1961; J. B. Ward-Perkins 1981; F. Sear 1989; A. Boëthius*, et al.* 1994; A. Claridge 1998, 61-99; P. Gros 2006. Coarelli is an exception to this, but he treats the Forum monument by monument instead of discussing its overall diachronic change: F. Coarelli 1983.

magnificent buildings. These presumptions have in passing given rise to discourse on the oddity of the site of Rome, focused around a low-lying area, in contrast to other Central Italic and Mediterranean city-states, mostly on hilltops and plateaus.

In this chapter I argue that vast deliberate architectural changes to the Forum Valley in the archaic period produced an entirely new landscape and that the actions have far reaching implications. They suggest the transition of Rome's community from a sustained, even prosperous, but semi-divided people with *individual* wealth to a rich *community* with far-reaching contacts and the means to build on a vast scale. They also demonstrate a deliberate attempt of enormous importance to transform Rome's topography. Those who initiated the reclamation of the area and the monumentalization of the plain with impressive architecture must have realized the change this would make to the city, but they could not have known its lasting effects: the decision defined Rome's cityscape.

## I. Dating the Forum and its monuments

Due to scarce finds, differing interpretations of strata and the difficulty of dating ceramics from the Latial IVA/B phase (ca. 730/20-580), scholars continue to debate the chronology of the Forum and several projects around it. The conflict is central to any discussion of the site, and so to begin, I examine the dating of two projects that were

crucial to the creation and monumentalization of the area: the Forum reclamation project and the Comitium.

### The Dates of the Forum reclamation project

Based on the analysis of cores taken across the Forum, Albert Ammerman has suggested that in the archaic period Romans purposefully raised the elevation of the Forum Valley by filling it with earth, ceramics, tuff and other debris over the course of several years (Fig. 2.1).[43] He argues that before this project the basin had been seasonally inundated, and its use and development were difficult or impossible. The fill project created a raised plain between the Capitoline and Palatine hills that was above the Tiber's annual flood level and suitable for construction and habitation. Archaeological evidence for the reclamation project lies in the seven lowest strata of Gjerstad's and Giacomo Boni's excavations at the so-called Equus Domitiani (Fig. 2.2).[44] According to Ammerman the debris and compacted earth in strata 28-24 of the excavation indicate a landfill, and the compressed earth, clay and dense gravel in strata 23-22, a finishing level and pavement of the new Forum plain.[45] The two strata above this initial pavement are also composed of gravel and constitute two repaving projects that would also date to the archaic period. While many archaeologists have accepted Ammerman's proposal,

[43] See below, "The Forum Reclamation Project" for a detailed examination of his arguments and the fill process. Cf. A. J. Ammerman 1990a, 638-644.
[44] E. Gjerstad 1953-1973, II.33, 44; A. J. Ammerman 1990a, 641-642.
[45] These numbers refer to Gjerstad's strata; cf. A. J. Ammerman 1990a, 641-642.

concerns about the precise dates of the project have inhibited research into its significance. Dates for the fill and the three pavements are bound to only a few ceramic fragments and the correlation of one stratum to another. Gjerstad's initial date of 575 for levels that correspond to the project quickly came under fire, and while scholars eventually settled on a date between ca. 650-625, recently Paolo Carafa and Eliza Gusberti have reawakened debate by suggesting a new, much earlier date of ca. 750-675.[46]

The two scholars make four arguments for their dating. First, Carafa argues that pavement 3 (stratum 20) dates to 600 and so pavement 2, pavement 1 and the fill below must date earlier.[47] Yet finds in pavement 3 include fragments of bucchero and Italo-Corinthian ceramics (Fig. 2.3). Giovanni Colonna has long argued that Italo-Corinthian ware is only introduced to Rome ca. 575; therefore pavement 3 must date after this.[48] Furthermore, the earliest known bucchero in Rome dates from ca. 625 and its common use and importation dates only after ca. 600.[49] In pavement 3, bucchero is not only found in significant quantity, it is the predominant ceramic material; in keeping with the wider Roman ceramic record, this suggests a date *after* 600. What is more, bucchero is also the primary ceramic fabric in pavement 2, again indicating a date after 600. If pavement 2 dates after 600, pavement 3 would date even later, and surely (based on the

[46] For Gjerstad's dating: E. Gjerstad 1953-1973, II.33, 44. For arguments against it: G. Colonna 1964, 4-11; G. Colonna 1977a, 485; J. C. Meyer 1983, 133; P. Gros and M. Torelli 1988, 78; A. J. Ammerman 1990a, 638-644; P. Carafa 1996, 17 n. 116; P. Carafa 1997, 499-501; P. Carafa 2000, 71.
[47] P. Carafa 2000, 71.
[48] G. Colonna 1964, 6.
[49] G. Colonna 1964, 6; F. M. Rosi 2004, 259, 263 with references.

Italo-Geometric fragment) after 575. If pavement 2 dates only as early as 600, the fill and pavement 1 could date comfortably to 650-625.

Next, Carafa argues that ceramics in the so-called Doliola, a sacellum where Romans kept objects for the *flamen dialis*, date the fill to the early seventh century.[50] Coarelli, whom Carafa follows, argues that one can identify the earliest site of the Doliola in a wall and bodies that Boni found at the bottom of his excavation of the so-called Equus Domitiani (Fig. 2.4-2.5).[51] He further argues that throughout the Republic and Empire, Romans preserved the site of the early Doliola by keeping archaic ritual materials on top of the sacellum's original location; these objects, he says, are present in travertine reliquaries from the "Equus Domitiani" (Fig. 2.6).[52] Carafa takes this argument one step further. He argues that the late-seventh-century ceramics found in the reliquaries might have been used in connection with a wall that was found on pavement 2; this, he says, provides a date for that pavement in the seventh century, and so, the fill below must date earlier.[53] Yet these ceramics and their travertine reliquary were found imbedded in the *Imperial* Forum pavement, and one must maintain that removed from their original location in antiquity, these objects have no stratigraphic value. There is no way to tie their origins to any particular stratum below. The wall founded on pavement 2 may have been part of the archaic Doliola and the vessels may have been used in that sacellum; if one follows Carafa and Coarelli's arguments, they may also have been used in

[50] P. Carafa 1997, 599-601; P. Carafa 2000, 500; E. Gusberti 2005, 119-124.
[51] F. Coarelli 1983, 292.
[52] F. Coarelli 1983, 292.
[53] P. Carafa 2000, 500.

connection with the bodies below the fill or in any other stratum. At present one cannot tie these vessels or their date of ca. 625 to any particular stratum.[54]

Finally, Carafa argues that middle Orientalizing impasto ceramics found in the fill and first pavement (strata 22-28) date the project to 675 or earlier.[55] Gusberti largely agrees with Carafa's dates adding that an earlier pavement may exist in stratum 24, and finds below it suggest the initial fill dates before 700 and as early as 750.[56]

I consider Carafa's arguments first. He insists that one can date the Forum fill between 700 and 675 based on precise dates given to impasto ceramics; yet many scholars warn against assigning constricted dates to impasto vessels: not only do styles and fabrics persist over long periods of time in impasto, they change drastically dependent on the site, and so it is difficult to compare dates from one city to another and establish a stable, precise chronology.[57] Furthermore, Gjerstad reports that strata 25-22b include not only the coarse ware, impasto and late impasto that Carafa studies, but also 61 fragments of buccheroid impasto and a few Italo-geometric finds, which

[54] Regarding the date of the finds, Coarelli suggests their manufacture ca. 675-650: F. Coarelli 1983, 292-296. They include two buccheroid impasto jars, one with a double spiral and fish decoration; the design of a double spiral with superimposed dotted emblem dates only after ca. 625: T. Rasmussen 1979, 69-70, and for consenting arguments cf. I. S. Ryberg 1940, 23; L. Ambrosini 2004, 228.
[55] P. Carafa 2000, 71.
[56] E. Gusberti 2005, 119-124.
[57] P. Carafa 2000, 71. Contra: G. Colonna 1964, 1-4; F. H. Parise Badoni 2000, 27. In his catalogue of impasto in Rome, Carafa cannot provide precise dates for impasto or coarse ware; for example he concludes that coarse ware is commonly found from the eighth to the seventh century, that it is especially common in the first three quarters of the seventh century, and returns to favor in the early sixth century: P. Carafa 1995, 127, 258.

Carafa neglects in his research (Fig. 2.7).[58] While particularly hard to date with precision, buccheroid impasto is widely present in Rome until ca. 625-600; this does not support a *terminus ante quem* of 675, so the stratum *could* date as late as 600.[59] What is more, in the finds from stratum 25 Colonna identifies a fragment of a Geometric krater with decoration datable ca. 650.[60] Carafa does not mention this find in his study, but together with the large quantity of buccheroid, the krater undermines a suggestion that the fill could date before the mid seventh century.

In her study of the fill, Gusberti suggests two separate dates for two separate landfill projects terminating in pavements at strata 24 (pavement 1a) and 22 (pavement 1b).[61] She states several times that nothing below stratum 24 (and pavement 1a) dates after 700; this is in part based on her reassessment of Gjerstad's buccheroid finds.[62] Gusberti argues that Gjerstad misidentified two fragments of buccheroid impasto, and that instead these are brown impasto; based on this assessment, she suggests that there is no buccheroid impasto in any of the fill (between strata 28 and 22).[63] Yet as her

---

[58] E. Gjerstad 1953-1973, II.52-57. Elisa Gusberti states that strata 28-24 do not have buccheroid impasto: E. Gusberti 2005, 119 and next paragraph; contra: E. Gjerstad 1953-1973, II.54-57, figs.34-37. Gjerstad does not illustrate all the fragments, but he lists and identifies more than 630 pieces of pottery in total: E. Gjerstad 1953-1973, II.52-57. Carafa does not mention these finds in his articles: P. Carafa 1996, 17 n. 116; P. Carafa 1997, 500-501; P. Carafa 2000, 71. Cf: G. Colonna 1988a, 472, where Colonna includes late bucchero and settles on a later date for the fill.

[59] T. Rasmussen 1979, 70; W. Regter 2003, 17 n.15.

[60] G. Colonna 1977a, 485; G. Colonna 1988a, 472. Gusberti cites Colonna's argument but does not confront its implications for her re-dating.

[61] E. Gusberti 2005, 118-124. On the pavements: D. Filippi 2005, 93-109. See below for more on the pavements.

[62] E. Gusberti 2005, 118-119.

[63] E. Gusberti 2005, 119-124. Gusberti, p. 119: "La presenza di frammenti di late e buccheroid impasto, ovvero di impasto bruno sottile lavorato al tornio apparentemente

arguments for these two pieces and her table of examined ceramics indicates, Gusberti was only able to inspect two out of 61 pieces of Gjerstad's buccheroid; it is unlikely that he would misidentify 61 pieces of pottery and it is difficult to make such an argument based on the inspection of just three percent of the evidence.[64] Gjerstad identifies 23 fragments of buccheroid impasto in strata 25 and 24, that is, below pavement 1a.[65] It is doubtful he was mistaken in all 23 classifications, and since buccheroid is only known to appear in Rome after 700, her suggested 750-700 date is highly unlikely.[66] In any case, Colonna's krater dating to ca. 650 comes from stratum 25, again below pavement 1a, and so both the lower fill (and a proposed pavement 1a) and the upper fill should date after 650.[67]

In sum, the Forum landfill and pavement 1 (a and b) date sometime after ca. 650. As the fill contains buccheroid pottery and ceramics with geometric design, which are largely absent in *sixth* century contexts, the fill also probably dates before 600. A date between 650 and 625 coincides with the disuse of the *Sepulcretum* beside the Temple of Antoninus and Faustina and the increased number of burials at the same time on the Esquiline (Fig. 2.8-2.9).[68] The transposition of burial sites away from the Forum area

---

esclusivo dell'età orientalizzante, come vedremo più avanti, è da verificare." On the finds as impasto: pages 121, 122; Gusberti offers no discussion of the 59 pieces of buccheroid she did not see.

[64] E. Gusberti 2005, 133-134.

[65] E. Gjerstad 1953-1973, II.52-57.

[66] T. Rasmussen 1979, 70; W. Regter 2003, 17 n.15.

[67] She does not mention which stratum this comes from: E. Gjerstad 1953-1973, II.52-57; E. Gusberti 2005, 118-119.

[68] For the dates of these burial sites, e.g. G. Colonna 1964, 6; M. Albertoni 1983; M. Barbera 2005.

suggests a changed use of the space at this time, perhaps in conjunction with the landfill. Finds at the Regia further suggest a date between 650 and 625 for the fill. In excavations there, Frank Brown notes that a significant flood destroyed the layers below the first stone building; the thickness of the flood layer indicates inundation was long-lived. Ceramics and wood associated with the layer on top of the flood date ca. 635-625 and objects below the flood level date ca. 670-650.[69] The contemporaneous move of the Sepulcretum suggests Romans recognized the environmental problem with the area as floods destroyed the early Regia site; the reclamation of the basin ca. 650-625 may indicate their reaction.

**The Chronology of the Comitium**

The Comitium is the second site in the Forum area with a disputed date. Filippo Coarelli first assembled evidence from Boni's early excavations of the Comitium, Gjerstad's summary of the finds and Pietro Romanelli and Maria Squarciapino's excavations in the 1970s.[70] These studies all present evidence for the development of a paved space at the edge of the Forum on the east slope of the Capitoline Hill in the archaic period. They indicate that builders first cleared the area and paved it with gravel; as they had done in the Forum, they subsequently repaved the Comitium twice, erecting

[69] F. E. Brown 1974-5, 19.
[70] F. Coarelli 1977, 166-171. For the earlier excavations and interpretations of finds: G. Boni 1900, 295-340; E. Gjerstad 1941, 97-158; P. Romanelli 1984. Squarciapino's excavations remain unpublished.

a marker, or cippus, on a base with the second pavement and then building a large stepped platform in connection with the third (Fig. 2.10).

Scholars largely follow Coarelli's chronology of these events, and I review it here to establish stratum numbers and elevations that have come into question (Fig. 2.11). He argues that the first Comitium pavement (strata 21-24 at 9.80 meters above sea level [hereafter masl]) dates between 625 and ca. 590.[71] Bucchero in this pavement activity provides the *terminus post quem* since the earliest bucchero in Rome dates ca. 625.[72] The layer of destruction on top of the pavement includes tiles and ceramics that date to ca. 600, and in Coarelli's opinion reveal buildings that accompanied the pavement (Fig. 2.12).[73] He dates the second pavement activity and the accompanying cippus (strata 14-20 at ca. 10.27 masl) to between 560 and 540. In the lower part of this pavement, he identifies a large number of early- to mid-sixth-century ceramics as evidence for the date.[74] The third pavement (strata 11-13 at ca. 10.69 masl) dates between 530 and ca. 480 based on the inclusion of a black-figure vase following the style of the "spurinas group," and four other ceramics that date to the last quarter of the sixth century or first decades of the fifth.[75] Accompanying this pavement is the first evidence for a raised stone platform with steps curving from the south to the west.[76]

---

[71] The numbering of these pavements and strata does not correspond to the numbering of the Forum strata at the Equus Domitiani.
[72] F. Coarelli 1977, 171, 180.
[73] F. Coarelli 1977, 180.
[74] F. Coarelli 1977, 171-172, 180-182.
[75] F. Coarelli 1977, 184.
[76] F. Coarelli 1977, 172, 184.

Again, Carafa questions the established chronology and argues a much earlier date for the area's initial use.[77] He begins by arguing that there was another pavement at the Comitium (henceforth, 1a) that predates Coarelli, Gjerstad's and Boni's first pavement.[78] According to Carafa, it is evidenced in a deposit of gravel from layer 16 in a trench of Romanelli and Squarciapino's unpublished excavations and was laid ca. 700-675 (Fig. 2.13). His date is based on a single find: a brown impasto olla that he believes must date to the first quarter of the seventh century.[79] Yet, again, impasto vessels are hard to date with this kind of precision. Furthermore, even if the olla dates ca. 700-675, similar seventh century impasto ceramics are present in Comitium strata dating as late as the middle Republic; a single find (especially one whose date is so difficult to establish) is not enough evidence to assign a stratum with a date.[80] Furthermore, at 10.72 masl, the level of this stratum is entirely out of place for an early pavement in the area. Coarelli's (and Gjerstad and Boni's) first pavement rests at 9.80 masl; their second at 10.27 masl and their third at 10.69.[81] The elevation of Carafa's pavement 1a fits better with Coarelli's third pavement ca. 10.69 masl. Carafa argues that pavement 1a could have a higher elevation than the others and still date before them.[82] He believes that although the location of Squarciapino's trenches is unknown, they may have been located on top of a high outcrop of cappellaccio; thus, he argues, Romans paved this higher area first

[77] P. Carafa 1998, esp. 84-87. In his publication, Carafa calls this pavement 1 and renumbers all of Coarelli and Boni's pavements with higher numbers.
[78] P. Carafa 1998, esp. 86-88.
[79] P. Carafa 1998, 70-84, 87.
[80] On the finds of impasto from the higher strata of the Comitium: G. Boni 1900, 325-340.
[81] See above notes 67-72. Cf. Carafa who agrees with these elevations: P. Carafa 1998, 87.
[82] P. Carafa 1998, 84-87.

and only subsequently paved the lower level with what Boni had called the first pavement[83] Yet Boni's trenches consistently exhibit three gravel pavements at the Comitium and Squarciapino's only one or two.[84] Were there earlier pavements in Squarciapino's area, one would expect to find more pavements, not fewer. Rather than a preexisting pavement, evidence from Squarciapino's trenches suggests Romans began paving the lower areas first, and once the Comitium rose above the cappellaccio outcrop, they began paving there; her pavements should correspond to Boni's pavements 2 and 3.

In addition to proposing pavement 1a, Carafa re-dates Coarelli's first and second pavements. He argues pavement 1 should date to ca. 650 instead of Coarelli's proposed date of ca. 600. Yet his analysis is confined to roof tiles from stratum 23, and so he fails to acknowledge the bucchero that Coarelli records in the pavement stratum.[85] The presence of bucchero precludes a date before 625. Carafa then dates pavement 2 to ca. 625-590 instead of Coarelli's proposed date of ca. 560-540; he does so based on what he labels as "finds in SQ [Squarciapino activity] I.12" (Fig. 2.14).[86] Yet previously when discussing finds from the same activity, he describes a kylix dating to ca. 560 (Fig. 2.15-2.16).[87] This stratum and pavement correspond, even according to Carafa, to Boni's

[83] P. Carafa 1998, 72-73, 84-87. On the outcrop of cappellaccio: A. J. Ammerman 1996a, 134.
[84] P. Carafa 1998, 44, 60, 70, 87.
[85] P. Carafa 1998, 87; on the bucchero in stratum 23, see above note 70.
[86] P. Carafa 1998, 87.
[87] Carafa presents three different dates for the same activity: ca. 625-590 in the final date chart (P. Carafa 1998, 87) ca. 630-550 (P. Carafa 1998, 79) and ca. 560 (P. Carafa 1998, 77, 79).

stratum 21, wherein Coarelli notes numerous fragments also dating as late as ca. 560.[88] Coarelli's *post*-560 date for the second pavement must stand.

In sum, evidence exists for only three archaic pavements in the Comitium area. Furthermore, Coarelli's chronology for the archaic Comitium remains the most accurate: pavement I dates after ca. 625-600, pavement II dates after ca. 560 and pavement III dates after ca. 530.

## II. Rome before the Forum intervention

With approximate dates established for two controversial projects in the Forum area, it remains to consider the site and its condition before the archaic period. Archaeological and literary evidence demonstrate that by the tenth century BCE people had begun inhabiting Rome; they set up communities primarily on the Palatine and Capitoline, and probably on the Quirinal and Esquiline (Fig. 2.17).[89] Until the 1950s, scholars held that in the ninth and eighth centuries small clusters of huts overlooked the central marshy basin of the later Forum Romanum and Velabrum, and that in the seventh and sixth centuries, these villages expanded and converged to create the city of

[88] F. Coarelli 1977, 171-172, 180-182; P. Carafa 1998, 60.
[89] On the literary history: Cic. *de re publica*, 1.10.17, Livy, I.6.3-I.34.12, Dion., II.1.1-II.46.1; for criticism: T. P. Wiseman 1995a. On the Archaeological record, e.g. E. Gjerstad 1953-1973, I, II; T. Cornell 1995, 48-118; C. Panella 1996; A. Carandini and R. Cappelli 2000; I. Baroni 2001, 291-298; P. Boccuccia 2001, 299-306; A. Cazzella 2001, 265-268; F. Lugli and C. Rosa 2001, 280-290; G. Forsythe 2005, 7-93.

Rome.[90] Based on his extensive excavations and research, in the 1960s Gjerstad backed this theory.[91] He argued that archaeological evidence from the Palatine and Forum area demonstrated the growth of settlements on the hills and their gradual expansion down into the Forum. His suggestion aroused a debate that would dominate much of late-twentieth-century scholarship on early Rome and the formation of the city.[92] Müller-Karpe argued to the contrary that Gjerstad's evidence from the Palatine and Forum demonstrated that Rome began as a single site on the Palatine and slowly spread to the Forum and beyond up onto the Capitoline in the sixth century.[93] Massimo Pallottino suggested a more nuanced approach, arguing for large settlements on the Palatine that were divided at first, then grew together and slowly expanded to join or appropriate small settlements on the other hills. Yet new excavations on the Capitoline and under the later Forum of Caesar have revealed early wealthy settlements and burials in these areas, perhaps as large as the early Palatine site.[94] It is hard to establish a clear picture of the situation, but it seems likely that settlements dotted many of the hills, some larger than others, and that over time communication between the communities allowed the

[90] Giovanni Pinza first argued for nucleated settlements: G. Pinza 1905.
[91] Though with a change to chronology: E. Gjerstad 1953-1973, I-III; E. Gjerstad 1961, 69-102; E. Gjerstad 1965 b, 1-74.
[92] E. Gjerstad 1961, 69-102; E. Gjerstad 1965 b, 1-74.
[93] For a succinct discussion of the argument, see M. Pallottino 1979, 208-211; the foundational arguments are in H. Müller-Karpe 1962.
[94] On the Capitoline excavations:I. Baroni 2001, 291-298; P. Boccuccia 2001, 299-306; A. Cazzella 2001, 265-268; F. Lugli and C. Rosa 2001, 280-290. The burials in the Forum of Caesar were reported between 2006 and 2009 in the popular press but remain formally unpublished.

sites to unite. How detached from one another the hilltop communities were and how sudden their cohesion remains uncertain.

New studies have, however, clarified one aspect of the argument: while Gjerstad, Pallottino and Müller-Karpe saw fragments of eight and seventh century huts in remains from the Forum Valley, it turns out that the basin was too frequently and heavily inundated to allow habitation at this early time (Fig. 2.18).[95] The Tiber, Rome's outlet to the Mediterranean, was a frequent source of devastation, and scholars have come to recognize that as long as Romans built in wattle-and-daub or other materials that disintegrate when saturated, urban change was confined to the hills and their upper slopes.

Studies of Tiber floods and the elevations of Rome's hills and valleys have helped define the limits of settlement in the early city. The surface of the Tiber in antiquity was approximately one meter lower than it is today, or approximately five masl.[96] In yearly floods it rose to between nine and ten masl, but only for short periods of time.[97] For longer spells of perhaps a month, it remained close to nine masl. The elevation is important because in the ninth through seventh centuries, Central Italic architects built in wattle-and-daub, pisé or other non-stone materials;[98] these were subject to ruin even when partially inundated for prolonged periods, and they could not therefore have been

[95] See below and A. J. Ammerman 1990a, 627-645.
[96] A. J. Ammerman 1990a, 636.
[97] A. J. Ammerman 1990a, 636; G. S. Aldrete 2007, 39-50. Ammerman also records that alluvial deposits from the Tiber register up to 9.9 masl in a core behind the Basilica Julia: A. J. Ammerman 1998, 219.
[98] E. Gjerstad 1953-1973, I, II; G. Cifani 1994, 185-188 with references; G. Cifani 1997, 55-57 with references.

sustainable below nine masl.[99] Ammerman and Filippi have traced the nine-meter-mark of Rome's natural ground level between the Capitoline and Palatine and from the Argiletum to the Tiber (Fig. 2.19).[100] They note several geological features that help establish the topographical limits of architectural development before the seventh century. First, in the seventh century the east bank of the Tiber in the area of the Forum Boarium was approximately 75 meters further inland than it is today.[101] Second, the Capitoline and Palatine both have summits at between 40 and 45 masl and both hills decline towards the Forum, the Capitoline at a steeper grade than the Palatine (Fig. 2.20).[102] Third, a gravel shoulder extended off the slopes of both the Capitoline and Palatine at approximately 9 masl in the areas of the later Temples of Saturn and Castor / Lacus Iuturnae (Fig. 2.21).[103] Fourth, a natural gully existed between the Palatine and Velia (2.22). Fifth, cores in the area of the Argiletum reveal that an elevation of less than nine masl was present past the Comitium and probably halfway up the later Forum of Nerva.[104] With this information in mind, they establish the nine-meter threshold. It extends from the west side of the Capitoline hill, curving around the south corner to the Area Sacra di S. Omobono (< 9 masl), it continues along the slope of the hill to the

[99] A. J. Ammerman 1990a, 631, 641.
[100] A. J. Ammerman 1990a, 627-645; A. J. Ammerman 1990b, 13-16; A. J. Ammerman*, et al.* 1992, 107-138; A. J. Ammerman and N. Terrenato 1996, 35-46; A. J. Ammerman 1996a, 121-136; A. J. Ammerman 1996b, 751-754; A. J. Ammerman 1998, 213-223; A. J. Ammerman and D. Filippi 2004, 7-28; A. J. Ammerman 2006.
[101] A. J. Ammerman and D. Filippi 2004, 16-17.
[102] A. J. Ammerman 1990a, 634-635, fig. 633; W. Alvarez*, et al.* 1996, 751-754; A. J. Ammerman 1999, 12-14, fig. 12-13.
[103] A. J. Ammerman 1990a, 631, 636; A. J. Ammerman 1998, 219-220; A. J. Ammerman and D. Filippi 2004, 18, fig. 18.
[104] A. J. Ammerman*, et al.* 1992, 107-138.

Temple of Saturn (> 9 masl), to the Comitium (= 9 masl) and to the Argiletum. From there, it curves back to the Sepulcretum (> 9 masl), where a small tail continues up the via sacra between the Sepulcretum and the Regia (> 9 masl). It curves back to the later Temple of Castor (partially > 9 masl); it follows the Vicus Tuscus, and then curves around the southwest slope of the Palatine for the length of the Valley of the Circus Maximus (< 9 masl).[105]

The area below nine masl was not marshy, as ancient authors believed; rather, it was seasonally inundated.[106] A stream must have existed in the center of the Forum basin, collecting runoff from the Palatine, Capitoline, Quirinal and Esquiline and excess waters that bubbled up in springs in the gravel beds, like the Lacus Iuturnae.[107] In winter and spring months, the stream in the middle of the valley would expand with rainwater and lower elevations close to the Tiber would gradually become inundated with its rising waters; eventually the area would flood (Fig. 2.23). In flood, the communities of the Palatine and Capitoline would not be able to communicate with each other as easily as during drier months.[108] The Palatine in particular would be isolated: excavations elsewhere have demonstrated that the valleys of the Colosseum and Circus Maximus also have elevations below 9 masl, and so the hill would have been reduced to a peninsula for

[105] A. J. Ammerman 1990a, 638-642; A. J. Ammerman and D. Filippi 2004, 7-28.
[106] Cf. Varro *LL* v.43, 156.
[107] A. J. Ammerman 1990a, 636; A. J. Ammerman and D. Filippi 2004, 18-20.
[108] The same would be true of communication with the Aventine, which would be cut off by a similarly low valley below the Circus Maximus.

a period (perhaps as much as a month) each year.[109] The only piece of land connecting the Palatine to the surrounding hills for that period of flood would be the strip of the Velia between the Regia and the later Arch of Constantine. With flooding in the low-lying Campus Martius, the Capitoline too would have been isolated except for the spur connecting to the Quirinal hill. No permanent construction was possible in the area of seasonal inundation; thus except for temporary structures, buildings must have been confined to the hills and their upper slopes.

On top of the hills, archaeologists have found substantial evidence of habitation and agricultural land use.[110] Though temples probably existed on the hills, no remains exist to indicate their character.[111] Remains of huts, stables and stores have come to light across the Palatine and on the Capitoline (Figs. 2.24–2.26).[112] Also, on the north slope of the Palatine excavators may have found an early city wall, but varying interpretations of the scarce finds leave its function open to debate (Fig. 2.27).[113] As to religious architecture, evidence exists for sanctuaries and their votive deposits at the site of the Regia, the Atrium Vestae and the northeast corner of the Palatine as well as at the site of

---

[109] On the elevation of the Colosseum and Circus Maximus valleys: P. Ciancio Rossetto 1985, 214-223; P. Ciancio Rossetto 1986, 127-134; C. Panella 1996, 11-19.
[110] G. Tagliamonte 1999, 14-22 and bibliography; I. Baroni 2001, 291-298; P. Boccuccia 2001, 299-306; A. Cazzella 2001, 265-268; F. Lugli and C. Rosa 2001, 280-290
[111] For example, ancient sources record Romulus building a Temple of Jupiter Feretrius on the Capitoline (Dion., II.34.4; Livy, I.10.5-7) and Jupiter Stator near the Palatine (Dion., II.50.3), and that Titus Tatius built a sacellum to Jupiter, Mars and Quirinus on the Qurinal: Varro, *LL*, 5.74; Festus, 302; Paul. Fest., 303; Pliny *NH*, 15.120 (or for Numa erecting this temple, e.g. Cic. *de re publica*, 2.20; Livy, 1.16.5, Dion., 2.63.3). Other temples, for example, include Vulcan (Dion., II. 50.2-3), the Sun and Moon, Saturn, Rhea, Vesta, Diana, Quirinus (Dion., 50.3), Janus (Livy, I.19.2-3), Pallor and Panic (Livy, I.27.7-8) .
[112] E. Gjerstad 1953-1973, IV.48-77; G. Pisani Sartorio 1982, 29-32; S. Zeggio 2006, 63-66.
[113] A. Carandini*, et al.* 1995 [2000], 64, and on other suggestions for the walls, see 201-208.

S. Omobono and by the Clivus Capitolinus; all are small, but demonstrate cult activity in areas that remained sacred to Vesta, Fortuna, Saturn and other gods through the late Empire.[114] It is remarkable that all cults with archaeological or literary evidence for activity dating before the mid seventh century whose locations are known are found on the hills and their slopes; there are no cults with known activity dating before the middle Republic in the area of the Velabrum, and no cults with activity dating before the late seventh century in the middle of the Forum.[115] This may reflect the restrictions of the natural environment of the valley until the contours were changed and the space freed from seasonal inundation.

Between the tenth and mid seventh centuries people established communities on the Capitoline and Palatine and perhaps the Esquiline and Quirinal. The settlements of huts, agricultural spaces, sacred precincts and perhaps boundary walls grew over time, and may have connected with one another over the spurs of the hills to the east; nature prevented and perhaps obscured the need for a communal area between the hills. As late as the early seventh century, people founded sanctuaries on the east slope of the Palatine and on the southwest slope of the Capitoline, non-centralized locations away from neighboring hills. In fact, new studies near the Colosseum Valley suggest that during the

[114] F. E. Brown 1935, 64-68; F. E. Brown 1967, 47-64; F. E. Brown 1974-5, 15-36; G. Pisani Sartorio 1982, 51-56; Il viver quotidiano in Roma arcaica: materiali degli scavi del Tempio Arcaico nell'area sacra di S. Omobono 1989, 29-32; R. T. Scott 1993a, 11-17; D. Filippi 2004a, 101-121; D. Filippi 2004b, 19-100; S. Zeggio 2006, 63-66; G. Cifani 2008, 109-110. Cf. E. C. de Grummond 2005.

[115] See below, "The Monuments and the Stage." In fact, there are some very small local wet places near cores 5 and 22 in the Velabrum series of machine-made cores, suggesting perhaps permanent water features.

second century, a major civic area may have been developing off the eastern slope of the Palatine, near the Meta Sudans.[116] In sum, people had settled the hills, and while some construction at the edge of the Forum basin suggests a growing connection between communities there, other sites indicate continued isolation.

## III. The Forum reclamation project

At the center of the Forum Valley at the "Equus Domitiani," in excavations reaching down to seven masl, Boni and Gjerstad found several layers comprised of earth and debris; though Boni makes little of their meaning, Gjerstad identifies them as the earliest levels of inhabitation in the area (see fig. 2.2).[117] He interprets an incision in the ground around one of the layers as the depression where a wattle-and-daub wall once stood, and further suggests that daub fragments from other layers indicate the presence of huts in these low strata (Fig. 2.28).[118] Ammerman sees the remains differently. Gjerstad had only seen the hut-wall depression in photos from Boni's excavations; Boni had been digging below the water table, and in Ammerman's estimation, the depression must be an excavation channel to draw off water; it circumscribes the trench, and Boni

[116] A. J. Ammerman 2009
[117] E. Gjerstad 1953-1973, I.21-85. Gjerstad records the level of the top of stratum 22b at 8.62 masl, but a comparison of the scale of the drawing to the layers and the elevation of Gjerstad's top layer to that measured in the 1980s by Giuliani, indicates that Gjerstad's elevation was off by ca. 40 cm: C. F. Giuliani and P. Verduchi 1987, 44-45.
[118] E. Gjerstad 1953-1973, I.45-46, 48, figs 21-23.

uses similar devices in other excavations.[119] Ammerman also explains that there are few fragments of daub and that these may not indicate habitation.[120] Furthermore, he suggests that Gjerstad's interpretation presents a problem for the chronology of the layers. Though each layer has few objects, the top four date between 650 and 600; citing other scholars, Ammerman reintroduces skepticism that four (or more) full phases of construction, life and destruction could transpire in just fifty years.[121] Perhaps the strongest argument that these are not hut layers is the natural setting of Rome in relation to the Tiber and the destruction that wattle-and-daub would experience on a yearly basis under flood conditions at 7-9 masl.[122] Evidence of annual reconstruction of huts is not only absent from the archaeological record, but also it seems an unlikely practice.

Instead of layers of early inhabitation, Ammerman suggests that the materials between seven and nine masl are evidence of a landfill purposefully deposited in the area of the Forum Valley to raise a vast plain above the Tiber's annual flood-level.[123] He argues that the condensed chronology of several strata indicates the calculated deposit of earthen fill and debris (including fragments of ruined daub walls) over the course of years, possibly a generation; furthermore he suggests that the fill was excavated from one location, possibly the Velabrum, and deposited in the Forum.[124] Analyses of clay beds in

[119] A. J. Ammerman 1990a, 639.
[120] See below and A. J. Ammerman 1990a, 632.
[121] A. J. Ammerman 1990a, 633.
[122] See above and A. J. Ammerman 1990a, 636-640.
[123] A. J. Ammerman 1990a, 639-643.
[124] Ammerman first suggested an organized dump: A. J. Ammerman 1990a, 643. In more recent work he suggests that the fill came from a layer of soil covering clay beds that

the Velabrum indicate they were used in the manufacture of Rome's earliest roof tiles, but these beds are below the archaic soil level. In order to access the clay, workmen would have extracted topsoil from the 4,000 $m^2$ area of the beds, and scholars suggest that this displaced soil may have constituted part of the landfill.[125] Wherever it came from, the accumulation of soil and debris in the Forum Valley raised the level of the basin to 8.6 masl. On top of the last layer of fill, workmen spread a compact level of earth and finally a thick layer of gravel with a surface at nine masl, creating the first pavement of the Forum Romanum.[126] The argument has gained considerable acceptance.[127] Recently Dunia Filippi has modified Ammerman's account; she believes Romans first paved the Forum at a lower level, arguing that stratum 24 is similar to strata 22-20, the three traditionally recognized pavements.[128] Her suggestion is possible but difficult to prove. Stratum 24 has gravel, a material absent in the other fill strata, but the film of gravel is just two or three pebbles deep, far thinner than in strata 22-20 where the pavements are thick with either 15-20 courses of gravel or larger pebbles. What is more, the gravel is not present throughout the stratum, but only occupies part of it, suggesting it might be a localized feature, not one that covered the entire Forum plain.[129] Perhaps

---

Romans used to produce their roof tiles in the Archaic period: A. J. Ammerman*, et al.* 2008, 27.

[125] A. J. Ammerman*, et al.* 2008, 11, 27. The soil is 3-4 m thick in some areas.

[126] On the levels, see E. Gjerstad 1953-1973, II.33.

[127] No major work on the Roman Forum has been written since Ammerman's publication, but authors who discuss the Forum in relation to early Roman history and topography now tend to cite his conclusions. See for example T. Cornell 1995, 94; P. Carafa 2000, 71; G. Forsythe 2005, 86; E. Gusberti 2005, 119.

[128] D. Filippi 2005, 105-115.

[129] Cf. A. J. Ammerman 1990a, 639-643.

stratum 24 indicates an intermediate attempt to pave the Forum and a realization that the elevation was still too low; workmen continued the fill with one more layer (stratum 23) followed by the eventual 9 masl pavement in stratum 22.[130] Whatever the case, the layers of fill and gravel between seven and nine masl must indicate an attempt at filling the Forum Valley to escape damage from prolonged Tiber floods, and the project eventually succeeded, providing a wide paved plain at the base of the Capitoline and Palatine Hills.

The image of the space before and after the project is utterly different: in the early seventh century, the space between the two hills was a concave seasonally inundated valley with streams running through it; after the reclamation project, a flat paved space spread below the hills and was largely free of flooding (Fig. 2.29). As Ammerman describes it, though, the project is still somewhat unclear and two essential questions remain unanswered. First: at what location between the Forum area and Tiber did designers decide the fill ought to end, and what are the implications of this boundary? Second: if runoff from hills and natural springs coursed through the valley before the landfill, how did builders manage the resulting stream during and after the project?

Ammerman and Filippi's cores in the Forum and the Velabrum reveal a startling disparity between elevations in the two areas during the archaic period.[131] Seven distinct layers of landfill elevated the Forum plain to nine masl, but a core immediately southwest

[130] As argued above, the existence of this pavement does no effect the dating of the fill. Late buccheroid impasto and Italo-geometric wares in stratum 25 and above secure a date after 650. See "Dating, The Forum Reclamation Project."
[131] A. J. Ammerman 1998, 219, fig. 212; A. J. Ammerman and D. Filippi 2004, 16-23.

of the later Basilica Julia and several other cores in the Velabrum exhibit no such archaic fill (Figs. 2.30–2.31).[132] Ammerman is quick to note that gravel films (very thin layers of gravel) are present in the Velabrum, but they do not correspond to the Forum project: their elevations are several meters lower, at 5.96 and 6.87 masl.[133] Above these strata, the cores exhibit no fill, but rather a centuries-long natural accretion that only reaches nine masl in the early-mid Republic.[134] This is in contrast to the Forum's sudden and purposeful archaic fill. Thus, elevations of archaic layers in the Velabrum are all below seven meters above sea level, and so, after ca. 650-600 when Romans raised and paved the Forum area, the valley between the later Basilica Julia and Tiber remained more than two meters lower than the Forum.

The different elevations in the two areas would require some kind of retaining structure for the Forum fill. Otherwise, runoff from the hills and Tiber floods would have inundated the freshly laid fill and unsettled it; when the river receded, it would have pulled the loose fill out toward the Tiber. This erosion would have started almost immediately; given that the project must have taken several years and that the lowest levels of fill were far below the annual flood level, inundation during initial phases would have destroyed the buildup almost as soon as it was laid. To keep the newly deposited earth from eroding, the project's planners must have constructed some kind of barrier to hold it back. It is unclear exactly where the retaining structure was, but it should have

[132] A. J. Ammerman 1998, 219, fig. 212; A. J. Ammerman and D. Filippi 2004, 16-23. The dating of the later elevations is clear from an abundant number of finds in core 11.
[133] A. J. Ammerman and D. Filippi 2004, 18.
[134] A. J. Ammerman 1998, 219, fig. 212; A. J. Ammerman and D. Filippi 2004, 16-23.

been somewhere under the later Basilica Julia between the elevated Forum and the low Velabrum. At precisely this location gravel beds on the Capitoline and Palatine, underneath the later Temples of Saturn and Castor, mark the nine-masl shoulders of the two hills; the buttress must have stretched between these two sites. The character of the embankment can only be hypothesized. The only excavation to have reached beneath the Basilica Julia was extremely small—at the lowest elevations, just a meter wide—and recovered very little. Still, at ca. 9.5 masl, just level with the fill, they found three blocks of cappellaccio which could belong to a retaining wall.[135] Further investigation is necessary in order to confirm such scanty finds. Even if these finds pertain to the embankment, they reveal little of its character. It may have been a wall or a stepped reinforcement that both held back the Forum fill and provided a stair to the Forum from the Velabrum. A stepped retaining wall is known from the landfill project at Selinunte in the mid sixth century.[136] The stair or stepped embankment with its double function is an interesting possibility, but not a necessary one. Two roads seem to have existed connecting the Forum area to the Tiber on either side of the embankment wall's presumed location. Archaeologists digging in the area of the Temple of Castor have found evidence that a roadway, later the Vicus Tuscus, already existed by the late seventh century.[137] This roadway may have been planned as a means of circumventing the retaining wall. A natural ramp also exists between the area of S. Omobono (near an

[135] G. Carettoni 1961, 59
[136] D. Mertens and M. Schützenberger 2006, 185-187. The steps of this wall do not seem to have provided access to the site. For further discussion, see below "Comparanda."
[137] I. Nielsen 1990, 89-104; I. Nielsen and B. Poulsen 1992, 39-40.

archaic port) and the area around the later Temple of Saturn, which is at nine masl.[138] This would become the Vicus Iugarius and may have already served as a roadway in the late seventh century, complementing the Vicus Tuscus at the opposite end of the retaining wall. Both pathways had a natural inclination from the Tiber up the slopes of the hills and onto nine-masl shoulders at the edges of the Forum fill, providing access to the newly raised Forum for people arriving from the river (Fig. 2.32).[139] In fact, through the middle Republic the two primary roadways between the Forum and the Tiber remained the Vicus Tuscus and the Vicus Iugarius, both flanking the depressed Velabrum valley; no major cults are known in the low Velabrum until the middle of the Republic, and the arrangement of the Temple of Saturn, Basilica Julia and Temple of Castor with their backs toward the Velabrum suggest a clear division of usable space from the lower reaches of the Velabrum. A retaining wall in the vicinity would not only have buttressed the Forum fill, but also dictated the development of the Forum area apart from the Velabrum, the two side roadways providing access between the two spaces.

The discrepancy in elevation between the Forum and Velabrum and the resulting need for an embankment highlights drainage concerns during and after the project. In passing, Ammerman notes that engineers must have installed drainage but does not

[138] On S. Omobono and the harbor: F. Coarelli 1988a, figs. 22, 50; and see chapter 2. On the natural ramps entering the Forum: A. J. Ammerman 1990a, 631, 636; A. J. Ammerman 1998, 219-220; A. J. Ammerman and D. Filippi 2004, 18, fig. 18.
[139] On one's arrival and experience of entering Rome: G. E. Meyers 2003, 161-193.

expound on the idea.[140] A drainage channel would have been essential to the success of the reclamation project. Natural streams would have existed at the bottom of the Forum and Velabrum valleys, and other streambeds (continuously or periodically inundated) probably also descended in the natural gullies between the Velia and Palatine and between the Arx and Capitolium (Fig. 2.33).[141] During the fill process builders must have channeled these waters away from the project to keep them from eroding the new fill. After workers finished the project and paved the Forum, a canal would have been essential to site maintenance. A free flowing stream left to inundate the newly raised space would have destabilized the fill, and over time, it would have carved out a bed; as the waters descended to the river, they would meet with the embankment, eventually overflowing or rupturing the wall. At some point during or after the project's completion, designers must have noticed this problem and built a canal through the area. As it exists now between the Argiletum and the Temple of Castor, the Cloaca Maxima is a mix of various reconstructions, the earliest of which dates to the mid or late fifth century.[142] Between the conclusion of the landfill ca. 625 and the construction of this stone canal ca. 450-400, however, workmen must have put in another canal. It may have been a clay-lined canal, such as one finds in Etruria at the time, or perhaps was lined with

[140] A. J. Ammerman 1990a, 633, 644; J. N. N. Hopkins 2007, 1-13
[141] For the natural slopes in these areas: A. J. Ammerman 1990a, 633; A. J. Ammerman*, et al.* 1992, 87-93; A. J. Ammerman and D. Filippi 2004, 18.
[142] see Appendix.

wood or even stone.[143] The path of this early watercourse is not entirely clear, but the location of the later stone Cloaca and the presence of a retaining wall may provide some clues as to where builders located the original canal. It is unlikely they would position it through the center of the fill, terminating it at the middle of the retaining wall; this would have left waters spilling down the embankment, pooling below the wall, unsettling its foundations. It is more likely that they directed waters to the edge of the embankment wall at the natural nine masl shoulders of the hills and then channeled water down to the Tiber. Corresponding precisely to such a plan, the fifth century Cloaca runs in a seemingly circuitous path from the middle of the Argiletum, diagonally across the Forum to the area beside the Temple of Castor (Fig. 2.34). This would be a perfect location to run a drain if one wished to circumvent the drop on the other side of the embankment wall. The canal would terminate at the corner of the wall at the edge of the gravel beds, and just below their 9 masl elevation. From here the stream could spill down the Palatine slope, into the central concavity, and to the Tiber.

For seventh-century Italy, the scope of the reclamation project is enormous. Engineers and workers had to harvest the fill from the Velabrum or another part of the city and transport it to the Forum; they had to quarry and lay stone or wooden pylons for the embankment, and they had to conceive a drainage system. As Ammerman and Filippi reconstruct it, the reclamation project stretched 100 m across the Forum between the Palatine and Capitoline and perhaps as far as 225 meters between the Argiletum and

[143] For clay canals, see for example J. Ortalli 1990, 7-41; J. Ortalli 1994, 291-296; V. Manzelli 1995, 229-240; J. Ortalli 1995, 61-69. Few stone canals in central Italy exist in this period and they are substantially smaller than what would have been needed in the Forum.

the embankment wall. The dimensions indicate over 23,000 $m^3$ of fill.[144] A proposed two-meter-thick embankment wall stretching the 100-meter expanse between the hills would require more than 500 $m^3$ of stone or wood.[145] The undertaking of the project must have been arduous and impressive. As remarkable as the execution was, the outcome would have been even more astonishing (Figs. 2.1, 2.32, 2.35). On approach to the city from the Tiber a visitor or resident was greeted with the two-meter-high embankment curving up the slopes of the Palatine and Capitoline. Climbing the embankment's stair or the ramps to either side a viewer met an artificial, flat expanse stretching 100 m wide and 250 m in front, all paved in gravel with a fresh-water stream running through it. Romans would soon cap this vast plane with a new series of monumental buildings and pavements.

**Comparanda**

The seventh and sixth centuries are among the most significant periods of drainage, damming and fill projects in ancient history, but it is hard to find undertakings

[144] Ammerman first suggested the fill was between 10 and 20,000 $m^3$, but this was before cores in the Argiletum indicated the fill's larger expanse: A. J. Ammerman 1990a, 641-642. Assuming a scalene ellipsoid with length radius = 112.5 m, width radius = 50 m and height radius = 2 m provides a volume of 47,006 $m^3$. The half of this being 23,503 $m^3$. The length of this ellipsoid, however, terminates at the wall, cutting off a significant amount of the landfill in the triangular areas at the corners of the wall, and so, the fill would have a higher volume.

[145] An earthen embankment is unlikely given that inundation would destroy it too easily, and a wooden embankment, though possible is equally difficult. Small slotted walls would not sustain the fill; thick pylons would have been required to withstand the pressure.

that are similar to the endeavor at Rome.[146] In part this is because every site has its own natural obstacles, and so, few sites necessitate the same kind of project. Still it is noteworthy that while most early reclamation projects have comparanda, the Roman one is unique. Etruscans are known for their cuniculi, and while these are not absolutely datable, it is possible that the earliest were excavated and functioning by the sixth century BCE.[147] By that time there are many examples of hydraulic works like them across the Mediterranean in North Africa and the Near East.[148] Open-air or covered, small or large, canals exist in the Mediterranean from Central Italy to Persepolis by the sixth century.[149] By the end of the sixth century, Darius I had dug a 140 km long, 50 m wide canal between the Red Sea and the Nile, effecting one of the greatest geological transformations of the first millennium BCE.[150] Large-scale land reclamation was, therefore common when Romans raised and drained the Forum Valley, and there is sufficient evidence to suggest that engineers and architects traveled the Mediterranean, disbursing knowledge of these projects and their tectonic principles.[151]

One possible comparandum for the Roman project is the terrace and retaining wall at Selinunte, though the visible remains date to the sixth century, just after the Roman reclamation (Fig. 2.36-2.37).[152] The environmental situation is different, as the

[146] A. K. Biswas 1970, 26-31; R. J. Garde 1978, 14-15; G. Garbrecht 1987, 10-21.
[147] F. Coarelli 1991, 35-41.
[148] G. Garbrecht 1987, 10; A. I. Wilson 2000a, 161-164; A. I. Wilson 2000b, 308.
[149] A. K. Biswas 1970, 29-31; R. J. Garde 1978, 14; G. Garbrecht 1987, 6-6; V. Manzelli 1995, 239; J. Ortalli 1995, 61-69; A. I. Wilson 2000a, 161-164; A. I. Wilson 2000b, 308.
[150] G. Garbrecht 1987, 10, cf. Herodotus *Histories*. 2.158.
[151] G. Garbrecht 1968, 612-618; R. J. Garde 1978, 1-17; P. Briant 2001.
[152] D. Mertens and M. Schützenberger 2006, 185-187.

Selinuntine project did not require drainage, but the problem and resolution are similar. City planners there had a choice of how to extend their city's building space, and they decided to expand to the east. The site did not allow for such an expansion naturally, as there was a steep eastward slope to the acropolis, and so engineers built a retaining wall to hold in earth and terrace a large portion of land for further construction.[153] Another comparison may lie at archaic Carthage, where it is possible that the *byrsa* (the city citadel) was raised and terraced by human intervention; given the state of the site, however, the scale of the project is unknown.[154] Perhaps the best comparison for the embankment itself is a massive land work and retaining structure at the Argive Heraion. This dates to the seventh century, contemporaneously with the Roman endeavor, and constituted a long stone wall that held back a large landfill.[155] As for drainage comparanda, one might look to many of the known early canals in central and southern Italy. In the seventh and sixth centuries BCE, canals as large as 3.1 m wide and 2.5 m deep existed in Bologna, Casalecchio di Reno, Magreta, rural Modena in Etruria, and Metaponto in Magna Graecia (Fig. 2.38). These V- and U-shaped channels were dug into the ground and lined with clay and gravel.[156] The clay acted as a barrier to keep water from seeping into the ground and when dry the clay and gravel held back the earth on either side of the canals, some of which were three times the width of the later stone Cloaca Maxima. Romans were in contact with people in these territories and could have modeled the early Forum

[153] D. Mertens and M. Schützenberger 2006, 185-187.
[154] S. Lancel 1979, 361.
[155] C. Antonaccio 1992, 90 with references
[156] E.G. J. Ortalli 1990, 7-41; J. Ortalli 1994, 291-296; V. Manzelli 1995, 229-240; J. Ortalli 1995, 61-69.

canal on such projects.[157] Yet a survey of projects in the archaic period yields no combination of the two reclamation types: drainage and landfill / embankment. It is possible, however unlikely, that architects at Rome imagined and implemented this project through trial and error; attempting the unknown would certainly have added to the project's difficulty. It is also possible that they knew of large-scale embankment and landfill projects similar to the later one at Selinunte, and adapted them to their site by looking to local drainage systems. In any case, the project is unusual for Central Italy in the archaic period. It was an enormous undertaking, and its scope and visual impact had few parallels on the peninsula. Though later than the Roman project and substantially larger, the Selinuntine terrace may help one imagine the visual impression of the Forum embankment. As one views Selinunte from afar, the terrace is hardly apparent; the city and its temples appear prominently on the horizon. Yet on approach to the south gate the project looms over the viewer, the monumental embankment wall proclaiming the city's resources, ability and fortitude.

**Implications for the archaic period and beyond**

If comparanda for the project are hard to locate, the overarching significance of the transformation of Rome's landscape is clear: the Forum reclamation project did nothing less than create the most fundamental of Rome's civic areas, and it dictated the city's organization and monumentalization for the coming millennium. The end result

[157] C. Renfrew and J. F. Cherry 1986, 2-6.

must have made a tremendous impression on Romans and foreigners alike. From the hills the Forum plain would look remarkably different and its utility was vastly improved. A new monumental wall greeted traders, envoys and other foreigners arriving from the Tiber, proclaiming the magnitude of the project and the wherewithal of those who created it. The project was perhaps the first monumental undertaking in the city of Rome and is certainly the first for which archaeological evidence exists. It changed the city's very geography and redefined its urban image. What is more, Romans had been living on hills in nucleated settlements that were at best connected through roadways in raised areas, but there was no central place for the different settlements to focus.[158] The archaeology of the Palatine and Capitoline demonstrates their predominant position in the early city's topography, yet while they looked over the valley at one another, they could not connect in any real permanent way. The reclamation of the Forum Valley unified these hilltop communities. It provided not only new land to expand on, but also new space on which Romans could focus their community. Roads could now exist directly connecting the hills, and the space could be traversed with relative ease throughout the year. Over the course of the subsequent millennium the presence of this communal site dictated the architectural and topographical development of the city. The Forum Romanum became a symbol of the city and the lifestyle of its inhabitants; it was also a showplace for some of Rome's most lavish architectural achievements. Not until Augustus' redefinition of the architecture of Rome in the Campus Martius and elsewhere would there be so fundamental a change to the city.

[158] see above, "before the intervention."

The transformation had not only lasting effects on Rome's urban development, but also immediate implications for the cultural transformation of early Rome and the development of the archaic community. As an act of human intervention in the natural world, the project indicates a purposeful transformation of the natural landscape; had it blended into the surrounding environment it may have been forgotten, unimpressive, utilitarian. Yet the distinction between the elevation of the Forum and the Velabrum necessitated an embankment from the start, and Romans would soon mark the space with stone paving and a monumental canalization project.[159] It must have stood out to contemporary viewers, and these signifiers of human intervention in the environment recorded that Romans had effected a change in their surroundings. What is more, the scale of the intervention indicates a critical change in Rome's culture and power. As I will further demonstrate below, the project was not essential to Rome's survival: it was certainly desired and clearly useful, but not vital. It thus represents a new stage in Roman history when people chose to exert new efforts in creating monumental projects that transformed the image of their city in ways unnecessary, but functional.

Two theories of monumentality address the project's grandeur and the excess involved in its execution; they both suggest that the Forum reclamation indicates a considerable moment of change in the history of Roman culture, not just Roman topography.[160] Janet Delaine argues that monumental structures have the power "to

[159] see below, "monumentalizing the ground."
[160] It is hard to say if the reclamation was the cause or the symptom of the change to Rome's culture; following the theories outlined below, and a general post-processualist framework, one would expect it was a symptom of culture change. Still, it cannot be rulled out that

reshape the face of the earth, and thus to create a new landmark to rival those of nature."[161] Romans undoubtedly put a monumental stamp on their city with the landfill, rivaling the natural environment with an intervention into the inherent geography of their site. Bruce Trigger has argued that monumentality indicates a general human interest to proclaim power:

> If economy of effort is the basic principle governing the production and distribution of those goods which are necessary to sustain human life, the ability to expend energy, especially in the form of other people's labour, in non-utilitarian ways is the most basic and universally understood symbol of power. Monumental architecture and personal luxury goods become symbols of power because they are seen as embodiments of large amounts of human energy and hence symbolize the ability of those for whom they were made to control such energy to an unusual degree.[162]

Romans could have expanded their city elsewhere, but chose to expand into the valley of the Forum.[163] The act signifies excess human labor and assets that are only available to cities and communities with a certain amount of power and resource.[164] What is perhaps more startling is that this was not the *only* such project. Similar, though smaller, fills were carried out along the north slope of the Palatine, around the area of the Vestal Virgins and perhaps in the Colosseum Valley after the Forum reclamation.[165] Thus, in its wake, it seems that land reclamation for the environmental improvement of

---

while it was a symptom of one aspect of culture change (as I argue below, Rome's growing relationship with the maritime economy), it also brought about culture change.

[161] J. Delaine 2002, 210.

[162] B. G. Trigger 1990, 125.

[163] see below "The hills, the valley and the oddity of the site of Rome."

[164] I. Hodder 2005, 18-20.

[165] For the north Palatine: A. J. Ammerman*, et al.* 1992; elsewhere A. J. Ammerman 2006, and personal correspondance.

the city's landscape was understood as an acceptable practice.[166] Romans were beyond building for utility. With the advent of the Forum landfill, one can identify Romans breaking the barrier in cultural development wherein necessity defines action; with this project they begin to act on a newfound power by producing monuments and monumental projects that effectively proclaim their new interests and abilities to residents and visitors alike.

### The hills, the valley and the oddity of the site of Rome

The idea that the reclamation reveals a new stage in cultural development presumes that Romans had a choice: they did not *have to* expand into the Forum valley, they did not have to enact the landfill project. Rather, they chose to, and they could only make that choice if they had a certain excess of means. It remains to examine whether or not Romans truly had a choice and then to posit a question: if they did not have to exert the effort, why did they?

Scholars have long contemplated the distinct nature of the settlement at Rome; other contemporaneous communities in Central Italy and the Mediterranean settled hilltops whereas Romans decided to focus their city around the low-lying Forum.[167] When one considers the early city and its natural landscape, however, the situation does

[166] For more on this: e.g. A. J. Ammerman 2000.
[167] In Italy, for example, Tarquinia, Bolsena, Acquarossa, Cerveteri, Rossellae, Murlo, Regisvillae, Vulci, Lanuvium, Gabii, Satricum, Ardea, Velletri, Segni, Pompeii, Capua, Cumae, Neapolis, Selinunte, Agrigento. Cf. G. Barker and T. Rasmussen 1998, 10-42.

not seem so anomalous. People at Rome too first settled on the tops of the Palatine, Capitoline, Esquiline and surrounding hills: the valleys were at first only used for burial. Only after centuries on those hills did they enact the Forum reclamation and begin to focus and unify their nucleated community around the valley plain. Rome was a hilltop community that moved into the Forum. Why, though, did Romans make the move?

The financial wherewithal of the city in the late-seventh and sixth centuries and the ever-growing area of domestic architecture down the north slope of the Palatine in the years preceding the project indicates a growing community and its need for more space. So there was a need, a necessity, but the need was for space, not necessarily space *in the Forum valley*. The insalubrious valley was not the only place to which they could expand their community, nor was it by any means the most environmentally or economically practicable. There were options—better options—for expansion. The existence of settlements and burials on many hills, including the Capitoline, Palatine, Quirinal and Esquiline, suggests that Romans could have expanded in many directions: why not over the plateau and spurs of the Esquiline, Viminal, Oppian and Quirinal to the east? The Esquiline is vast and would have provided outstanding space for new construction, the Quirinal also; their geologies and hydraulic situations are far superior to the natural cavity between the Capitoline and Palatine. Had Romans expanded their community to these hills, they would not have had to diverge from the pan-Mediterranean cultural norm of living on hilltops; they would have saved enormous efforts that were exerted in the Forum reclamation; they would have been free of floods; and they would have had wide spaces to build a growing community. In short, the city

could have grown more easily and with good reason in other directions, but it did not, because Romans *chose* to reclaim the Forum valley.

Why, though, did they do this, especially since it required such a drastic change to the geography of the city, a change that was incongruous with ubiquitous hilltop settlement patterns? The project certainly made a grand statement. It demonstrated that Romans were able to overcome the obstacles of their environment. Yet this could not have been the *only* motive for the endeavor; surely there was a reason beyond showmanship.[168] That reason must be the Tiber. Scholars have long recognized Rome's position as the first major community along its banks to be a fundamental reason for the city's prominence.[169] It is in the late seventh century, contemporaneously with the Forum reclamation, that foreign imports begin increasing in Rome, and the city's wealth seems to have soared at the turn of the sixth century.[170] Scholars see Tiber Island as a link between the east and west banks of the river and communities on either side; along with it, the purported construction of the Pons Sublicius in the seventh century and evidence at S. Omobono for subsequent trade in expensive and avant-garde foreign objects indicate Rome's increasing connection to the river and exploitation of the riches

[168] It is unlikely they chose the site because the city was focused to the west already. Certainly sanctuaries at the base of the Capitoline near S. Omobono would have been distant from a community focused around the Esquiline, but the creation of the Forum and the concentration of the community to the west alienated the older and more prominent triad on the Quirinal as well as preexisting sanctuaries on the east slope of the Palatine. On the Quirinal triad: J. Bayet 1969, 40, Varro *LL*, 5.158. On the east Palatine sanctuaries: S. Zeggio 2005, 63-76; S. Zeggio 2006, 66-66.

[169] C. Belardelli and A. M. Bietti Sestieri 1986, 63-69; S. Quilici Gigli 1986, 71-89; G. E. Meyers 2003, 162-169; G. Forsythe 2005, 80.

[170] G. Colonna 1988a, 467-515; M. Cristofani 1990, 9-145; T. Cornell 1995, 81-118, 198-214; J. C. Meyer 1980.

and contacts that it brought past the city.[171] To move the community to the eastern hills would have been to turn its back on the Tiber, the rapidly developing artery to Mediterranean trade and inland markets. The only way to allow for architectural growth *and* maintain the city's command of the Tiber was to create an environment for continued construction that anchored the city to the river's banks. It was for this reason that Romans chose the Forum valley for their city center, and in doing so remade their urban landscape.

The reclamation of the Forum Valley fundamentally altered Rome's topography and signifies a fundamental change to the community of Romans. With this project they chose to position their growing city on the edge of a bustling trade route. The landfill transformed a once-unusable, low valley into an artificial plain and brought together a once-divided community. What once had been a hill-top community like many around the Mediterranean was transformed into a city around a low valley plain—the Forum.

## IV. The monuments and the stage

With the Forum raised and available for construction, architects quickly began exploiting the artificial geography. Within a century and a half they capped this new plain with a more permanent stone pavement and impressive temples and civic buildings,

[171] On the area north and east of Tiber Island, including the Pons Sublicius and S. Omobono: F. Gilotta 1990, 141; A. M. Colini 1980, 43-45; F. Coarelli 1988b. For more on trade, the Tiber and cultural openness at Rome, see Chapter 3.

signaling the start of the Forum's function as an arena for civic activity and some of the city's great architectural works.

### The Comitium

Cores and excavations below the Comitium reveal that Romans first uncovered a cappellaccio outcrop and cleared the area during the mid seventh century, perhaps in a purposeful exploitation of the raised stone surface as a stage.[172] In the later part of the century, soon after they completed the reclamation project or perhaps in tandem with it, workmen laid the first gravel pavement on the site. The paving dates to somewhere between 625 and 575 BCE and is 9.8 masl, or almost a meter higher than the first Forum paving.[173] The wide range of dates allows that the first Comitium pavement may also correspond to the second Forum paving, which occurred sometime between ca. 600 and 550 and was ca. 9.35 masl at the center of the Forum, possibly higher at the north corner by the Comitium.[174] Without a full excavation of the Forum it is hard to determine the diachronic correlation of the Comitium and Forum projects and how their juncture appeared in antiquity. If one accepts a high date ca. 650 for the reclamation project, one

[172] On the dating of the Comitium, see above "The Chronology of the Comitium." On the geological setting and the clearing of the area: A. J. Ammerman 1996a, 121-136.
[173] See above, "Dating the Comitium."
[174] Again, the elevation is not taken from Gjerstad's given elevation (E. Gjerstad 1953-1973, II.33), but rather from a re-measuring of the strata based on Gjerstad's large section in the SAR and the Giuliani measurements as well as a comparison with the scale in the published section: E. Gjerstad 1953-1973, II.35. See also above, note 112. Evidence from the area of the Temple of Castor and the Regia suggests the Forum pavement gradually sloped from the north and south to the middle of the plain.

might see the clearing of the Comitium area at the same time as an indication of a shared project and the first Comitium paving corresponding to the second Forum paving sometime after 600.

Not long after the Forum was first paved, Romans marked the area of the Comitium with a pavement. A thick burn layer covering this first pavement contained numerous terracotta tiles, indicating to Boni, Gjerstad and Coarelli the presence of some kind of impressive building with a terracotta roof (Fig. 2.12).[175] A gorgon antefix and a revetment with a man on horseback may indicate a style of decoration similar to the contemporaneous early-sixth-century Regia and a sacellum in Cumae.[176] The building accompanying the first pavement is among the earliest terracotta-roofed structures in Rome, and recent analysis of the tiles indicates that the fabric comes from clay beds in the Velabrum.[177] That the roof was of local manufacture signifies Romans' independent ability to build even their earliest monumental structures on site. The use of clay from the Velabrum, in an area below the archaic soil level, also may imply a relationship between the Forum landfill project and the earliest clay roofs in Rome: harvesting soil from the Velabrum to fill the forum, craftsmen then used the exposed clay beds to make tiles for buildings surrounding the very space they had just filled.[178] Another reading of the evidence might suggest that Romans knew of the clay beds before envisioning the

[175] E. Gjerstad 1953-1973, II.218-219; F. Coarelli 1977, 181. Cf. N. A. Winter 2009b, 144.
[176] E. Gjerstad 1953-1973, II.250-251. The antefix belongs to the Lapis Niger deposit and may not accompany this building, but the location and similar date suggests the association. On the comparison with Cumae: N. A. Winter 2006c, 353-354. See also, "The Regia" below. Cf. N. A. Winter 2009b, 169-170.
[177] A. J. Ammerman*, et al.* 2008, 25.
[178] See above, "The Forum Reclamation Project" and A. J. Ammerman*, et al.* 2008, 27.

reclamation; when searching for a way to dispose of the earth atop the clay, they realized they could use it to raise the Forum valley. Either reading suggests a close connection between the creation of the Forum plain and the exploitation of clay beds for tile-roofed buildings like the one associated with the early Comitium.

How the Comitium was used in this period is not clear; later literary sources say it was founded either by Titus Tatius as a gesture of reconciliation and communal gathering after the Sabine War or by Tullus Hostilius along with the Curia as a meeting place for senators and magistrates.[179] Though some see the terracotta roofed building as evidence of a Curia, the association is not certain. Perhaps Romans immediately used the newly paved space and the building associated with it as a place for senators to assemble before voting; perhaps this function was not witnessed until the late sixth century and the start of the Republic.[180] In any case, the tiles indicate one of the earliest known monumental structures in Rome and its date in the early sixth century corresponds with the Regia of ca. 580 and its first terracotta roof; it is also roughly contemporaneous with the erection (ca. 580-570) of the first temple at S. Omobono, a building that inaugurated dramatic change to Italic temple design.[181]

In the mid sixth century Romans laid a second pavement in the Comitium, and on top of it they raised an inscribed cippus on a short cappellaccio pedestal (Fig. 2.10,

[179] For Titus Tatius: Tac. *Ann.*, 12.24; for Tullus Hostilius" Cic. *de re publica*, 2.11. In general: F. Coarelli 1995, 309-311.
[180] On the function of the Comitium in the Republic: F. Coarelli 1995, 309-313.
[181] On the Regia, see below; on S. Omobono, see Chapter 3.

2.39-2.40).[182] Scholars debate the precise function of the cippus and how it characterizes the area. Coarelli claims that it marks the site of the Volcanal, a place sacred to Vulcan sometimes used to call civic assembly.[183] He argues that proof of this exists in a votive deposit found next to the cippus; the deposit includes a fragment of an Attic krater painted with the name of Hephaestus and showing that god's return to Mt. Olympus. The reference to that deity on a site within the Comitium suggests to Coarelli that the space around the cippus was the Volcanal. He argues further that the fragment proves that already in the early-mid sixth century, Romans were allying their divinities with Greek gods.[184] What is more, he suggests that the inscription on the cippus including the word *recei*, archaic Latin for "king," must refer to Servius Tullius, the purported ruler of Rome when the cippus was inscribed and erected between 570 and 560.[185] He concludes that the cippus marks that king's invocation of the Volcanal along with the Comitium and Curia.[186] While the style of the vase is datable to ca. 570-560, contemporary with the cippus, the fragment is part of a much later first-century-BCE deposit, and therefore at

[182] F. Coarelli 1977, 171-172, 181-172 & figs. 171, 174.171.
[183] F. Coarelli 1977, 175, 179 cf. Dion. VI.67.2.
[184] F. Coarelli 1977, 188, 215-229.
[185] The date of the cippus has been brought into question; some believe its inscription is an archaizing copy, not an original. L. S. Meritt and I. E. M. Edlund-Berry 2000, 104 with references. The argument stems from the use of grotta Oscura, which comes from a region Rome did not traditionally control until the fourth century. Also, the moulding is more popular in the Republic than in the sixth century. Still, the moulding could date to the sixth century, and the Lavinium altars do provide a parallel. Also, Romans did not traditionally control the Alban hills, where the Peperino for so many funerary chests lies, nor did they control the Aegean, the source of marble for one funerary chest in Rome. The grotta Oscura walls of Rome probably date to the Republic, as that enormity of material for them would require real control over the quarries, but acquiring material for one small cippus does not seem unlikely in the archaic period, given that an array of other imports from the north appear throughout Rome at the same time.
[186] F. Coarelli 1977, 188, 215-229.

present cannot be definitively connected to the cippus, the Comitium or the Curia in the sixth century.[187] What is more, Gellius (quoting Verrius Flaccus) emphatically states that during the middle Republic, a statue in the Comitium was removed to the Volcanal.[188] The statement indicates that the Volcanal is outside of the Comitium. In fact, literary sources do not mention the Volcanal as being inside or part of the Comitium at all; instead, they often refer to it as being above (*supra*) the Comitium. The cippus, which is well within the Comitium, would therefore not be part of the Volcanal.

Another theory is that the cippus belongs to the supposed tomb of Romulus. Gantz has argued convincingly that in the late Republic, Romans believed the cippus and other objects below the Lapis Niger—a late Republican black stone pavement at the western rim of the Comitium—were part of a tomb planned for Rome's first king.[189] Yet Gantz also makes it clear that textual sources indicate the association began only in the late Republic. Also, excavation found no burial around or below the monuments and no indication that they were associated with any grave or votive goods until well into

[187] F. Coarelli 1977, 188.
[188] "The statue of that bravest of men, Horatius Cocles, which stood in the Comitium at Rome, was struck by lightening. To make expiatory offerings because of that thunderbolt, diviners were summoned from Etruria. These, through personal and national hatred of the Romans, had made up their minds to give false directions for the performance of that rite. They accordingly gave the misleading advice that the statue in question should be moved to a lower position (*suaserunt in inferiorem locum perperam transponi*) … it became evident, in exact accord with what were later found to be the proper directions, that the statue ought to be taken to an elevated place and set up in a more commanding position in the area of Vulcan (*constititque eam statuam, proinde ut verae rationes post compertae monebant, in locum editum subducendam atque ita in area Volcani sublimiore loco statuendam*)." Gell. Misc. 4.5.1-4. Cf. A. Gellius 1946.
[189] T. N. Gantz 1974, 350-355.

the Republic, long after the cippus was first set up.[190] Whatever associations it may have gained later, the cippus was probably not first seen as a tombstone.

Some indication of the initial function of the marker may instead lie in its inscription and location. Scholars debate the significance of the archaic Latin text; most of it is difficult or impossible to translate at present, and large portions are missing.[191] A few words do, however, lend some meaning to the monument. The words *sakros es/ed*, probably equivalent to *sacros esto*, a condemnation, would seem to indicate a legal text with religious guidelines prescribing consequences for those who violate the law.[192] The word *recei*, probably a dative for "king," suggests to many scholars the presence of the kings of Rome; to a few others, it indicates only a *rex sacrorum*.[193] Other phrases on the cippus (e.g. *iouxmen/ta capia duo tau[r-]…kalato/rem)* suggest the presence of sacrificial victims and a herald of the kings. For some, this signifies the official presence of the kings of Rome at sacrifice around the cippus, to others the sacrificial nature of the site under a *rex sacrorum*.[194] One might cautiously suggest that the inscription indicates the cippus either was part of or marked the location of rituals undertaken in this area of the Comitium, be they associated with a king or with sacrifice or both.[195] To some degree, the inscription would also have been a prescription for those rituals and suggests a civic

---

[190] T. N. Gantz 1974.
[191] The two primary translations of the text can be found in P. G. Goidanich 1943, 477; R. E. A. Palmer 1969, 51. Cf. F. Coarelli 1977, 230.
[192] For the interpretation, originally: C. Hülsen and J. B. Carter 1906, 108; recently, B. Santalucia 1994, 8-9 The interconnectivity of law and religion in Rome would render this both a legal and a religious marker: B. Santalucia 1994, esp. 3-34
[193] F. Coarelli 1977, 230. On the *rex sacrorum*: R. E. A. Palmer 1969, 51.
[194] P. G. Goidanich 1943, 477; R. E. A. Palmer 1969, 51; F. Coarelli 1977, 230-231.
[195] For a similar reading: F. Coarelli 1977, 230-232.

structure in place that would allow such a formal and lasting demarcation of commonly held sacred (and legal) procedures. Such an interpretation fits well with literary sources on the Comitium. Livy states that it was a *templum* from the beginning and scholars note that among other rituals, the auspices had to be taken before an assembly of senators could have a formal meeting there.[196] The inscribed stone marker may be evidence of the officials and rituals linked with these meetings.

The location of the cippus reinforces such an interpretation. It is in a slightly raised position in relation to the rest of the Comitium, and in subsequent phases of construction, new architecture distinguished it and the space around it. Soon after erecting the cippus, architects designed two platforms, flanking it; four steps provided access from the floor of the Comitium to these platforms, and two steps mediated between the floor and the elevated space around the cippus (Fig. 2.41). Immediately west of the marker a wall connected the back of the two platforms and closed the cippus within the space of the Comitium. The architecture indicates that the cippus was part of (within) the Comitium, closed off from the area outside the meeting place, but also distinguished within the Comitium by its elevation, accessible by the short stair. The exact function of the cippus and the area left bare around it remains unclear, but the inscription and isolation evokes a strong sense of sanctity at the site, one that highlights literary references to the Comitium as a *templum*. The area of the cippus would remain one of the most venerated spaces in the Comitium throughout the Republic, gaining an

[196] On the Comitium as a *templum* and on rituals in the space: D. Detlefsen 1860, 128-160; R. E. A. Palmer 1969. Cf. Livy 5.52.16.

altar in the fourth century and other sacred monuments and votives through the first century BCE when it was covered over by the Lapis Niger.

In the late sixth or early fifth centuries, Romans paved the site of the Comitium yet again, this time further monumentalizing it with a stepped platform in cappellaccio blocks (henceforth, platform C) (Figs. 2.41–2.42). Its south (rear) wall is irregular in shape, but the north-facing front is straight with three stairs rising to a large stage. It terminates to the west with a low open space, at the western edge of which is the cippus still on its cappellaccio paving.[197] The wide, open space between the cippus and the west edge of the platform suggests a monument of some kind in the place of the later altar, G (Fig. 2.43 C, G, E).[198] Immediately west of the cippus the stepped structure continues, again as a platform with three steps on the north leading to a raised area(platform E); the two platforms seem clearly to be related.[199] Archaeologists found the eastern edge of platform C in excavations; it may continue after this break, but there is an end or an opening here, as the steps do not continue to the easternmost corner. Platform E continues in some manner to the west, but this area remains unexcavated. The platform is the second example of monumentalization at the Comitium, following the building on pavement I. In the context of other projects from the late sixth and early fifth centuries, the platform demonstrates a growing trend of architects choosing a permanent material for construction, stone, in an attempt to produce not just large, but lasting

[197] F. Coarelli 1977, 172, fig 174.172.
[198] On structure G: F. Coarelli 1977, 172-173, fig. 174.
[199] F. Coarelli 1977, 172.

monuments.[200] In the same period they would raise the colossal Capitoline Temple, a second temple at S. Omobono, a new paving of the Forum in stone, an impressive temple to Castor and Pollux, a new stone version of the Regia and possibly the Atrium Vestae to speak only of archaeologically documented civic projects.

**Structures along the northeast landfill**

No archaic structures have been found to the immediate east or southeast of the Comitium. Pliny states that the Temple of Venus Cloacina existed from the eighth century in recognition of a site of purification after the Sabine War; even if he and others can be trusted, they give no indication of the shrine's location or appearance.[201] Its archaeologically attested foundations only date to the Sullan period, and so no archaic remains exist to corroborate the literature, indicate the archaic structure's character, or even whether or not the sanctuary had a building in the archaic period.[202] A *templum iani* is also supposed to have existed somewhere in the Forum near the Argiletum from some time in the mid seventh century.[203] Louise Adams Holland suggests that it was originally created as a *templum* (with no building) to propitiate the gods of the Forum stream as their boundaries were broken with the perpetual traffic of the Via Sacra; one can imagine

[200] On the definition of monumental as the attempt to build an enduring impressive structure, see Chapter 1.
[201] On the literary tradition: Pliny *NH*, XV 119-122; Livy, III.48.5, and later, Cypr. *de id. Van*, 4; August. *civ. dei*, IV.8; Min. Oct., 25.8; Lact. *Inst.*, 1.20.11.
[202] D. Vaglieri 1900, 61-62; D. Vaglieri 1903, 97-99; F. Coarelli 1983, 84 n. 19, 20.
[203] L. A. Holland 1961, 22-23 Cf. Livy 1.19.2.

a need for such a *templum* after so large an interference with the Forum stream as the landfill project.[204] Again, however, there are no remains for this structure to suggest its existence or its image. Far to the east of the Comitium, across the Via Sacra from the Regia and directly on top of the Orientalizing *Sepulcretum* is a small building of contested function. Gjerstad identifies two phases of construction in the archaic period (Fig. 2.44).[205] The earliest employs opus craticium or pisé and dates to the late seventh or early sixth century.[206] The second phase dates to the early sixth century and is similarly constructed, but also exhibit remains of a terracotta roof and stucco walls.[207] The two phases of the structure are therefore roughly contemporaneous with the first two phases of the Comitium, the first two stone buildings at the Regia and the hut and first temple at S. Omobono. Coarelli identifies the first building and its reconstruction as the house of the Cloelia family and suggests it (and the family) may have been associated with the shrine of Venus Cloacina. Both names (Cloelia and Cloaca) have roots in the Latin verb cluere, to purify, and a statue of Cloelia represents her as *potnia hippon*, just as Venus Cloacina (often conflated with Venus Equestrius) was *potnia hippon*.[208] A more measured analysis of the finds suggests it was a structure of three rooms, perhaps with a central "megaron" vestibule, and probably served as a house.[209] While a precise function and attribution remains in question, the house may be an early example of elite homes

[204] L. A. Holland 1961, 26-27.
[205] G. Boni 1903, 165-170; E. Gjerstad 1954, 86-154. For more recent analyses of the finds: F. Melis and A. Rathje 1984; L. Manino 1989; A. Zaccaria Ruggiu 2003
[206] E. Gjerstad 1954, 133.
[207] E. Gjerstad 1954, 133.
[208] F. Coarelli 1983, 82-84. Recently, M. B. Roller 2004.
[209] A. Rathje and I. van Kampen 2001, 383-388.

flanking the Forum to the north and south, a feature of the space better known in the Republic.

Underneath the Temple of Caesar archaeologists found a large number of terracotta tiles, revetments and painted stucco pieces that are extremely difficult to ascribe to one building or another.[210] During the excavations, a few postholes and beaten-earth floors were found at ca. 11.58 masl in a stratum datable to the late sixth century.[211] The continued building of huts in this area after the Forum fill indicates that while stone and terracotta architecture was used more and more often, wattle and daub was still a material of choice—even in prominent areas of the Forum—through the late archaic period.[212] The early-sixth-century fragments of architectural terracottas are identical to those associated with the third phase of the Regia, and probably belong to it; stucco pieces may belong to the archaic house at the *Sepulcretum* or the archaic Temple of Castor.[213] It is likely, therefore, that no major building occupied the area under the Temple of Caesar and that the wattle-and-daub structures with beaten earth floors may have been shops or stalls on the new Forum plain. As Esther Van Deman and Russell T. Scott suggest, the Regia provided the eastern façade of the Forum.[214]

**The Regia and the Atrium Vestae**

[210] E. Gjerstad 1953-1973, II.265-294.
[211] E. Gjerstad 1953-1973, II.267-273.
[212] The date is based on the inclusions of stratum D.7 which all date to the late sixth century. the Black glazed bowl that Gjerstad dates to the 5th century is among the type of contested objects that Colonna suggests should be dated earlier: G. Colonna 1964, 1-12.
[213] G. Cifani 2008, 123.
[214]R. T. Scott 1993b, 167.

Frank Brown and Russell Scott have argued for five different reconstructions of the Regia from the late seventh to late sixth centuries; all have cappellaccio foundations and probably had mud-brick walls with terracotta roofs.[215]

The first two buildings are similar in plan and according to Brown must date between the late seventh and early sixth century (Fig. 2.45).[216] The flood and destruction of huts in the area ca. 625 provides the *terminus post quem*, and the third building's date ca. 580-70 a *terminus ante quem*. While the precise plan of the first two buildings is uncertain, remains of stone socles with doorways indicate there were two rooms at the west end opening onto a large walled courtyard with a gravel street bordering its southern perimeter; in the second of these two phases the only major change was a widening of the courtyard to the north, perhaps indicating an enlargement rather than a total reconstruction (Fig. 2.45-2.46).[217] Along with the Comitium, this is the earliest evidence for a stone-based building around the Forum plain. Also like the first building at the Comitium, the early Regia's function is unclear. Some scholars suggest it was a house, perhaps for a king; if this was the case, its function changed early on.[218] Already by the middle of the sixth century there are signs of multiple religious spaces around the

[215] R. T. Scott 1999, 191-192.
[216] F. E. Brown 1967, 52-53; F. E. Brown 1974-5, 19, cf. R. T. Scott 1999, 191. Here Scott argues the last huts were destroyed in the late seventh century, but does not propose the construction of the first major building, phase I, until the early sixth century.
[217]F. E. Brown 1967, 52-53; F. E. Brown 1974-5, 19-21. A clear break in the stone foundations of one of the west rooms indicates the doorway to the courtyard. Cf. F. E. Brown 1974-5, 19-212.
[218] On the Regia as house or regal quarters, e.g. S. Stopponi 1985, 186-191; D. Filippi 2004a, 119-120; C. Scheffer 1990; F. Prayon 2004; F. Prayon 2009.

structure, and later literary sources suggest that in the early Republic and perhaps even in the late Regal period it was a religious building.[219] If instead the first building shared its function with subsequent phases, it would have been one of early Rome's most prestigious religious spaces. In the late-Republic and Empire the Regia was the seat of official duties for several of Rome's chief sacred orders, including the Vestal Virgins, Pontifex Maximus and *Rex Sacrificalis*.[220] It is difficult to say what orders would have existed here in the archaic period, or if they were associated with a king or Vestal Virgins across the pebble street to the south. Still, it is clear that the first building had two rooms that fronted a large courtyard; these forms would persist in every subsequent building on the site, and just a century later, when Romans built the fifth building, they generated a plan that would endure for a millennium. The continuity of form may suggest continuity of function and a religious building from the start.

Archaeologists have been able to date the third phase of construction to ca. 590-570 based on architectural terracottas.[221] The plan of this building is hard to discern from the archaeological remains, but again, a trapezoidal courtyard and two rooms to the west are present (Fig. 2.47). From this phase it is the terracottas that provide the most striking information. They consist of roof tiles, a disk acroterion, gorgon antefixes, a foot belonging to an acroterion and a series of reliefs with processing felines, minotaurs and

[219] For sixth century evidence of religious activity throughout the building, see below, phases four and five. On the literature and the site's later use, e.g. F. E. Brown 1967; R. T. Scott 1999, 189-192.
[220] R. T. Scott 1999, 190 with references.
[221] As compared with similar terracottas from around Rome, Cumae and Pithecusae. S. B. Downey 1995, 1-2; R. T. Scott 1999, 191; N. A. Winter 2006c, 353; N. A. Winter 2009b, 144-148

birds or sirens. Susan Downey first suggested that the disk acroterion with painted tongues had no precedent in Italy, but Nancy Winter has since related it to a form in Campanian roofing systems found a Cumae (Fig. 2.48).[222] Winter argues that the disk is unique in this period to Etruria and Latium and may suggest that designers are looking outside their region (and away from places scholars traditionally associate with early Rome) for architectural inspiration in the early sixth century. The gorgon antefixes support this theory; their style differs from the few comparanda in early-sixth-century Etruria and Latium, and they find their only stylistic parallels in nearly identical antefixes from Cumae and Pithecusae (Fig. 2.49).[223] Though the Pithecusae antefixes lack a context for dating, the Cumaean gorgons date to the very early sixth century.[224] Winter suggests a connection between the Campanian style acroterion, the gorgons and the purported, failed attempt of Tarquinius Priscus to secure the Sibylline books from Cumae in the early sixth century.[225] Whether or not one accepts an early association with Rome's most famous oracle, the terracottas indicate a link between Rome and the Bay of Naples.

Yet it is the frieze from this phase of the Regia that has caused the greatest scholarly debate (Fig. 2.50). In a recent summary of the discussion, Downey concludes that the bull-headed man is uncommon in Central Italic architectural decoration, as are

[222] S. B. Downey 1995, 2; N. A. Winter 2006c, 350-351; N. A. Winter 2009b, 210.
[223] N. A. Winter 2006c, 352-354.
[224] N. A. Winter 2006c, 353.
[225] N. A. Winter 2006c, 354 Pliny, *NH* 34.22.

animal processions, and suggests that their best comparanda are on Corinthian vases.[226] Felines, birds with outstretched wings and even bull-headed figures exist in Corinthian ceramic iconography and the Roman building is the first to transcribe them onto terracotta.[227] Contemporaneous and later revetments from S. Omobono, Poggio Buco and Lavinium also have scenes of processing animals with mythological figures and may indicate a brief trend away from more typical banqueting and racing scenes used throughout the Italic peninsula in this period.[228] In sum, the reliefs from the third building at the Regia move away from styles and iconographies that are common in Central Italy. The acroterion and gorgon antefixes show a clear dialogue with builders and sculptors working in the Bay of Naples and the animal and mythological reliefs indicate an early adoption of Corinthian vase iconography for architectural ornamentation. Alongside terracottas on a temple at S. Omobono, the imagery on the Regia presents Romans' early interest in non-local trends for architectural sculpture and indicate the city's initial attention to broad Italic and Mediterranean cultural interaction.

Greek and local ceramics and terracottas in contexts relating to the fourth Regia suggest the next phase of construction dates to ca. 530. Though the plan for this reconstruction is again uncertain, two rooms are apparent to the far east of a trapezoidal courtyard (Fig. 2.51).[229] In the western area of the building there was a short stone base, perhaps an altar, that would remain in use through the Empire. The terracottas from this

[226] S. B. Downey 1995, 20-30.
[227] S. B. Downey 1995, 20-30; N. A. Winter 2006c, 354.
[228] S. B. Downey 1995, 25-26. Downey suggests the Regia frieze is the only one with mythological figures, but the Lavinium friezes have a chimaera.
[229] R. T. Scott 1999, 191.

phase are poorly preserved, but female head antefixes and strigilated simas popular throughout Central Italy remain (Fig. 2.52).[230] Scholars have argued for a close comparison with female head antefixes from Caere and suggest that they may have been produced in the powerful Etruscan city to the north.[231] The quick change from a Campanian roofing system and contacts in the south to roof decoration created in one of Italy's most prominent polities may further indicate that Romans were accepting of and interested in ideas and styles from divergent cultures.

If the date of the fifth and last archaic building on the site is less secure, its plan is the clearest. Ceramics associated with the fill below and the road to the south date the structure to the late sixth century, after ca. 520, or very early in the fifth century.[232] Five courses of stone foundations support mud brick walls plastered in clay for three rooms to the south of a new trapezoidal courtyard (Fig. 2.53-2.54).[233] South of the rooms Romans repaved in cappellaccio a road that facilitated communication between the Forum, Regia, Atrium Vestae and Palatine.[234] Scott notes that the rooms of this building phase are precisely aligned with the cardinal points and suggests a close relationship with the area of Vesta, perhaps in line with the altar in that precinct.[235] The courtyard contains a well and several cappellaccio bases, probably for wooden columns.[236] Workers laid a pavement of cappellaccio in the courtyard and in the three southern

[230] S. B. Downey 1995, 60-65.
[231] F. E. Brown 1974-5, 33; S. B. Downey 1995, 68-71.
[232] F. E. Brown 1967, 54; F. E. Brown 1974-5, 17, 33-36.
[233] F. E. Brown 1967, 54-59.
[234] F. E. Brown 1967, 54-64.
[235] R. T. Scott 1993a, 11-13; R. T. Scott 1999, 191.
[236] R. T. Scott 1999, 190.

rooms, and they inserted a round cappellaccio hearth in the westernmost room; the courtyard has a drain running from the middle to the northwest, and a large altar first built in the fourth building was enlarged with a square base (Figs. 2.55–2.57).[237] The basic forms associated with earlier structures are still present in the new building: there is still a large courtyard with rooms at one side; the new plan, however, would dictate the site's image throughout the Republic and Empire (Fig. 2.58).[238] In two Republican reconstructions builders changed the size of the rooms slightly and erected stone columns, but otherwise they maintained the plan of the late archaic structure through its 800 year history. They used the hearth in the westernmost room for centuries, perhaps as part of the *sacrarium* of Mars.[239] Given the origins of the room and hearth in the fifth building, the association with Mars may stretch back to the late sixth century. The east room, perhaps a sanctuary of *Ops Consiva*, may also have retained in the Empire a sacred storeroom function that began in the late sixth century.[240]

To some scholars, this building's plan indicates a major change in Rome's cultural connections in the late sixth century. Carmine Ampolo draws a salient comparison between the fifth Regia's plan and that of an archaic building under the Tholos of the Athenian Agora. The Athenian structure, known as Building F, dates to ca. 550-525, purportedly under Peisistratos, and Homer Thompson associates it with the later office

[237] R. T. Scott 1999, 191.
[238] F. E. Brown 1974-5, 17; R. T. Scott 1999, 189-190.
[239] F. E. Brown 1974-5, 17, 35-36; R. T. Scott 1999, 190.
[240] F. E. Brown 1974-5, 17, 35-36; R. T. Scott 1999, 190.

of the Prytaneis, or chief Athenian council.[241] Like the Regia, the Athenian building has three rooms oriented directly west to east, facing a large trapezoidal courtyard to the north with columns lining the southern and northeastern walls of the court (Fig. 2.59).[242] According to Thompson, this building along with the archaic Bouleuterion, meeting place of the council of five hundred, were closely linked with the purported overthrow of the Peisistratid tyranny and the reforms of Kleisthenes.[243] While the Athenians built the Bouleuterion after the reforms, probably ca. 510-500, Building F was already standing before the reforms and probably assumed a new role (as the Prytaneion-annex) after the change in government.[244] At Rome, the date of the fifth Regia in the very late sixth or early fifth centuries, at the purported time of the overthrow of the monarchy, and its new and persistent plan correspond to the Athenian building's plan and political circumstance.[245] What is more, across the Forum, Romans contemporaneously reconstructed the Comitium; the large polygonal stepped platform recalls the meeting place of the archaic Bouleuterion, both structures meant to hold the cities' large assemblies in the wake of a fallen tyranny. For some, the argument is compelling: the forms remarkably similar, their orientations precisely the same, dates highly suggestive, and political climates strikingly analogous. The contemporaneous political overthrows

[241] On the date: H. A. Thompson 1940, 28-33. On the function of the building: H. A. Thompson 1940, 40-44.
[242] H. A. Thompson 1940, 16-19.
[243] H. A. Thompson 1940, 40-44.
[244] S. G. Miller 1978, 43-45.
[245] If one is to believe there is a correlation between the two buildings, the date of the Athenian building is much before the Roman one, and so the influence would have traveled from Athens to Rome, not the other way around.

and architectural overhauls of key civic spaces at Rome and Athens suggests to Ampolo and a few others that there may have been profound change in Rome's connection to the wider Mediterranean at the turn of the sixth to fifth centuries, and if political reform was the impetus, Romans must have been in close contact with Athenians to adopt both their populist interests and consequent civic architectural forms.

In the end, however, the connection is only a hypothesis. Many scholars caution against a close reading of the literature on the Roman overthrow of the monarchy. Its date and tone are so close to the Athenian democratic revolution that it may be an annalistic contrivance imposed on early Rome by late Republican authors in order to enliven their history.[246] If, then, the connection is less systematic, and designers only borrowed the architectural form, they still would have had extensive contact with people in Athens or immigrants from the Greek city. It is unlikely that a passing merchant or brief visit to Athens would prompt architects to so fastidiously follow a foreign design in one of the most prominent buildings in their city center. Scholars suggest the adoption of a foreign architectural form indicates a pervasive cultural exchange and in this case, it would mean substantial, lasting contact between Romans and Athenians.[247] Such contact has been suggested for Athens and Etruria, and it is difficult to imagine, with the Tiber

[246] Alföldi dismissed this part of the literary tradition as entirely derived from Greek tropes and based largely on Thucydides' description of the Athenian overthrow: A. Alföldi 1965, 72-84. Cf. T. Cornell 1995, 226-241; and also G. Forsythe 2005, 147-150. Still, if one accepts the literature, it is clear there that the Athenian overthrow pre-dates the Roman by between one and four years.

[247] E.g. D. Mertens 1994, 196-197; for more, see chapter 3. I hold that if there is influence it must come from Athens to Rome; the buildings in Athens simply date too long before the Roman ones for the influence to be the other way around.

allowing access to so much of inland Etruria, that equally pervasive contact did not occur at Rome.[248]

Not every scholar agrees that a connection (political *or* architectural) between the buildings in Rome and Athens is present. In any case, the plan and design of the last archaic Regia marks a tremendous change in the architecture of the city. The new building's layout would persist for at least 800 years, and in this building designers envisioned a cappellaccio pavement across the courtyard for the first time. They did so precisely when they rebuilt the Comitium, erecting a large stone platform there and not long before they would build the Forum's first monumental temple to Castor and pave the entire expanse between the Capitoline and Palatine in stone. With the colossal Temple of Jupiter and its foreign architectural forms rising over the Forum, the image of the city was radically changed a century and a half after Romans had established the first building on the site of the Regia.

Across a small street from the Regia lay remains of the Atrium Vestae. Based on recent soundings and excavations, archaeologists have suggested three archaic phases of construction there in the archaic period. By and large, dates for these finds correspond to Brown's dating in the Regia and seem to connect to a road between the two sites, perhaps the Vicus Vestae.[249] Like the Regia, before the landfill, there is evidence of huts

[248] On Athenians trading with Etruria: C. Reusser 2002

[249] R. T. Scott 2009. See also N. Arvanitis 2004, 146-152; a full report of finds from this excavations remains unpublished and dating for finds from these excavations has been brought into question. On selected finds and overall interpretation of the site.

in the Area of Vesta, just alonga pebble road that separated the two.[250] The remains are few and do not provide a complete image of the site, but they may suggest something of its character. Cappellaccio blocks and terracotta roof tiles found in a context dating to the late seventh and early sixth century suggest an early phase of construction.[251] These may belong to the same roundof construction as a sealed and diused well found in separate excavations. That well seems to have been filled with debris and closed off sometime in the mid fifth century, perhaps after a fire that also seems to have destroyed the second Regia.[252] The plan of this building is unknown. Another structure of unknown plan with a well seems to have followed this first phase between ca. 575 and ca. 520 and was soon destroyed in a fire (Fig. 2.60, "Saggio A").[253] The last archaic remains from the site date to the late sixth century; one series of excavations found several cappellaccio walls that form a building of indeterminate plan, though it seemsto have rectilinear rooms opening onto a courtyard (Fig. 2.60).[254] In excavations during the 1980s, Scott also found several slabs of a cappellaccio platform around a well that he argues originally belonged to this late-sixth-century Atrium Vestae (Fig. 2.60, "pozzo").[255] The stones are aligned with the cardinal points, and the Regia's contemporaneous orthogonal reorientation suggests to Scott that the two complexes had

[250] R. T. Scott 2009, 7.
[251] N. Arvanitis 2004, 147.
[252] R. T. Scott 2009, 9.
[253] N. Arvanitis 2004, 147-148.
[254] N. Arvanitis 2004, 147-152. Arvanitis reconstructs cubicula, but so little of their walls remain that even this is tendentious.
[255] R. T. Scott 1993a, 11-13; R. T. Scott 1993b, 165-166.

a religious connection.[256] The pavement and well associated with it are east of the Republican temple of Vesta, and based on Ovid's association of the temple with an altar to the east, Scott argues this area must have supported the late-sixth-century altar.[257] Though one cannot establish a precise plan of the site in the archaic period, several features are clear.

The area of the Atrium Vestae was in use by the seventh century; in the late seventh or early sixth century, alongside the Regia and Comitium, it too may have experienced monumentalization with stone walls and a terracotta roof. A reconstruction soon followed and finally in the late sixth century, Romans monumentalized the area of the Atrium Vestae yet again with a stone-walled building. Though the precise nature of the cult of Vesta is not clear at this point, the location of the materials immediately under and to the west of the Republican and Imperial sanctuary and house of the Vestals suggests the cult was established and functioning with a substantial building by the end of the archaic period.

**The Temple of Castor**

Around the northwest corner of the Palatine hill from the Atrium Vestae, the Lacus Iuturnae had by the early fifth century long been a sacred spring. According to a mixture of historical tradition and myth, between 499 and 496, Romans fought rebellious

[256] R. T. Scott 1993a, 11-13; R. T. Scott 1993b, 165-166.
[257] R. T. Scott 1993a, 11-13; R. T. Scott 2009, 11-16

Latins at the battle of Lake Regillus, where Aulus Postumius prayed for the aid of Castor and Pollux, in whose name he vowed a temple should he win; soon after the victory, the Dioscouri appeared at the site of the Lacus Iuturnae to water their horses and proclaim Rome's victory.[258] In recognition of his promise, Postumius founded their temple just across from the site of their epiphany. However apocryphal the divine tale, recent excavations have unearthed terracottas, and foundation walls that demonstrate Romans built a monumental temple to Castor and Pollux across from the Lacus Iuturnae in the early fifth century, supporting Livy's account that Postumius' son dedicated the Temple in 484.[259] Its construction coincides with a new Forum pavement to be discussed below and perhaps the above mentioned fifth Regia and stone platform at the Comitium.

Remains indicate the building was truly monumental, one of the largest and most extensively decorated temples in archaic Central Italy. Its remnants are incorporated into the concrete podium of a first century BCE reconstruction, and it is oriented to the northeast, facing across the Forum plain. The temple has its foundations at the edge of the Palatine hill, and the ground level around it slopes sharply upward from the Forum side on the northwest to the Palatine side on the southeast (Fig. 2.61).[260] Excavations into the later (Metellan and Augustan) podia of the temple revealed that builders sank one or two courses of cappellaccio foundation into the natural gravel beds on the south

[258] On the battle and the Dioscouri: Dion., VI.13. On their appearance at the Lacus Iuturnae: Dion., VI.12.1-2; Plut. *Aem*, 25.1-2; Plut. *Cor.*, 3.4. For more on the sources and the dates: R. M. Ogilvie 1965, 286; I. Nielsen and B. Poulsen 1992, 46, 54-45.
[259] On the date of the remains: I. Nielsen and B. Poulsen 1992, 75-79, 157-171; Livy also omits the epiphany of the Dioscouri: II.21.12, II.42.5.
[260] I. Nielsen and B. Poulsen 1992, 39-41, 76, pl. 11.

and east side of the temple and onto the Forum fill on the north and west side; they reach a depth of ca. 10.75 on the east and ca. 10.5-10.8 masl on the west.[261] On top of the foundations, workers built a tall cappellaccio podium capped with a 20-cm-thick floor of cappellaccio slabs (Fig. 2.61-2.62).[262] In total, the podium is 27.5 m wide and 37-40 m long, only slightly smaller than the Metellan and Augustan reconstructions.[263] The temple floor towered almost five meters above the Forum on the north and west sides and four meters on the Palatine side. A full elevation is unclear, but Nielsen suggests that the columns and walls must have been stone, as wooden columns could not have supported the wood and terracotta roof.[264] Archaeologists reconstruct an approximate plan for the building based on the grid of foundations that they found during excavation. These suggest a triple cella temple with three colonnades occupying a deep porch (Fig. 2.63).[265] While the plan is hypothetical, a similar use of grid-like foundation walls to support superstructure elements in earlier temples is strong evidence for the tripteral, prostyle, triple-cella reconstruction.[266] Fragments of simas, antefixes, openwork crestings and perhaps a doorframe revetment reveal rich terracotta ornamentation.[267] The sima was adorned with a strigil course atop a painted guilloche band and anthemion frieze

[261] Excavators record that in trench T the lowest block would rest at 10.53 masl, but the lowest excavated block rests at 11.43; the lower courses are therefore hypothetical. The conjecture is, however, corroborated by the low position of blocks in trenches F and D which reach 10.8 and 10.75 masl: I. Nielsen and B. Poulsen 1992, , 39-41, pl.13.
[262] I. Nielsen and B. Poulsen 1992, 72, Pl. 11.
[263] I. Nielsen and B. Poulsen 1992, 75.
[264] I. Nielsen and B. Poulsen 1992, 78.
[265] I. Nielsen and B. Poulsen 1992, 76-79.
[266] Cf. the Capitoline Temple, Marzabotto, Pyrgi (Temple B) and Satricum (Temples I and II).
[267] The doorframe may not be archaic and could date as late as the second century BCE. I. Nielsen and B. Poulsen 1992, 157-171.

similar in style and coloring to the revetments of the slightly earlier Capitoline Temple as well as temples at Veii (Portonaccio), Pyrgi (A), Falerii Veteres (Sassi Caduti) and Satricum (Temple II) (Fig. 2.64).[268] The antefixes are full-bodied silens and maenads, a relatively new style and form particular to Central Italic roofs.[269] Together, the foundations and terracottas reveal one of the most opulent temples in archaic Central Italy; it matches the size of celebrated temples at Pyrgi, Ardea and Satricum, and stucco and terracottas associated with it indicate a rich decoration.

The temple's form and decoration also indicate the adoption of new trends spreading from foreign and local sources. As Nielsen suggests, the grid of foundations is uncommon in Central Italy, but paralleled at Pyrgi and Caere; one might add Marzabotto (C), Satricum and the Capitoline Temple in Rome (Fig. 2.65).[270] In general, archaic Central Italic temple builders construct foundation walls under superstructure walls and thresholds and only pillars below columns (Fig. 2.66); a few temples have longitudinal walls under colonnades, but only the Temple of Castor and the other comparanda at Pyrgi, Satricum, Caere and Marzabotto have transverse walls under colonnades.[271] The

---

[268] Nielsen compares it largely to Pyrgi and Fallerii Veteres, but the publication predates excavations of the Capitoline Temple and full publication of the Satricum revetments. See also chapter 3 and I. Nielsen and B. Poulsen 1992, 157-171, pls. 137-141, I-V.

[269] A. Andrén 1940, CLXXXIII.

[270] On the Comparison with Pyrgi and Caere: I. Nielsen and B. Poulsen 1992, 78-79. On Marzabotto and Satricum: E. Brizio 1889, 259; J. A. K. E. De Waele 1981, 29-31. The Capitoline Temple foundations do not form a grid, but are composed of intersecting longitudinal and transverse walls that are not found elsewhere except in the grid plan foundations of these temple. On the foundations of the Capitoline Temple: chapter 3.

[271] With Italic temples, distinguishing support for walls and colonnades is difficult; still, the existence of one of the two is usually conclusive based on analyses of foundations and terracottas. On general reconstructions: G. Colonna 1984, 396-411; G. Colonna 1985, 53-65, 67-78, 80-83, 88-92, 98-101, 127-134; H. Damgaard Andersen 1998; G. Colonna 2006. For

reason for the difference in construction technique at these sites may be contact with Greek engineers who routinely built walls, not pillars, under colonnades.[272] Perhaps Romans were in contact with builders at Pyrgi who had recently completed Temple B and were working on Temple A; scholars have long suggested a Greek influence on these buildings.[273] On the other hand, a strong Greek influence on the Capitoline Temple in Rome, completed just a quarter century before the Castor Temple suggests that Romans had a preexisting interest in Greek forms, styles and tectonics and possibly Greek craftsmen at Rome.[274] A Greek connection suits a Temple to the Dioscouri, decidedly

---

individual sites where it is possible to hypothesize a basic superstructure plan: Marzabotto (Temples b, c, d, "Tinia" Temple) – E. Brizio 1889, 258-260 Pl. I-X; Gabii – G. Colonna 1981b, 51-59; Pyrgi (Temples A and B) – G. Colonna 1965, 191-219; G. Colonna and M. Pallottino 1970, 36-43, 275-287; Satricum (Temples I and II) – J. A. K. E. De Waele 1981, 7-68; P. Chiarucci and T. Gizi 1985, 47-53; Pompeii (Doric temple) – J. A. K. E. De Waele and R. Cantilena 2001, 88-113; Vulci B. Massabò 1988-1989, 103-135; Rome (Castor) – I. Nielsen and J. Zahle 1985, 61-79, esp. 76; Orvieto – L. Pernier 1926, 137-164; Ardea – E. Stefani 1954, 6-30; Veii (Piazza d'Armi) – E. Stefani 1944, 178-290.

[272] On archaic Greek temples: western Greek temples in general – D. Mertens and M. Schützenberger 2006, 97-155, 216-309; Archaic temples in general – W. B. Dinsmoor 1975, 69-113, 123-146; A. W. Lawrence and R. A. Tomlinson 1983, 141-159, 160-173. On the correlation between foundations and superstructures in Greek architecture, e.g. J. M. Cook and R. V. Nicholls 1998, 11-12 and recently, F. A. Cooper 2008, 230-234 On specific sites, e.g. Metapontum – D. Adamesteanu*, et al.* 1975, esp. 109; Assos – F. H. Bacon*, et al.* 1902, 141, plate 141; Samos – E. Buschor 1930, 1-162, esp. 172; Temple of Apollo at Delos – F. Courby 1931, pl. II, III; Locri – A. De Franciscis 1979, 49-100, figs. 105-134; Paestum (Foce del Sele) – J. De La Geniere*, et al.* 1997, 337-344; J. De La Geniere*, et al.* 1999, 501-507; Corinth – H. N. Fowler*, et al.* 1932, pl. I, V; Didyma – G. Gruben 1963, esp. 78-85; Ephesos – D. G. Hogarth*, et al.* 1908, pl. I, XII Naxos – V. Lambrinoudakis and G. Gruben 1987, 569-621 abb. 513; Paestum (Hera I) – D. Mertens*, et al.* 1993, 5-15, tafel 14-17, 20; Syracuse (Olympieion) – P. Orsi 1903, 369-391; Apollo Alaei – P. Orsi 1933, 22-27, figs. 23-24; Corfu – G. Rodenwaldt 1939, tafel 3, 22.

[273] G. Colonna 1965, 192; D. Mertens 1980, 49.

[274] See chapter 3; cf. W. Alzinger 1982, 24-26; M. Rendeli 1989, 49; D. Mertens 1994, 195-200; J. M. Turfa and A. G. Steinmayer, Jr. 2002, 6; P. J. E. Davies 2006, 187-190.

Greek (especially Laconian) deities.[275] What is striking, however, is that once the building was complete, this aspect of its construction would disappear. The plan, elevation and decoration of the temple follow forms that were by now well established in Central Italy, and they are what visitors would see; the unseen foundations, though indicate Greek influence. The situation strongly suggests Greek workers in Rome. Had Romans wished to harness Hellenic forms to impress a viewer, they would have incorporated them into the visible aspects of the building. Here, however, the Greek influence is only evident in unseen tectonic practice.

Lavinium and Tusculum are the only two sites in Central Italy with a longer history of Dioscouri cults than Rome; both were purportedly involved in the opposition to Rome at the Battle of Lake Regillus where the Roman cult and temple was vowed.[276] The invocation of the Dioscouri at the battle may indicate Postumius' wish to supersede these towns' claims to the demigods. Romans exerted similar claims to the gods of conquered cities with the *evocatio* of Juno Regina from Veii to the Aventine in the early fourth century and perhaps when they combined cults of Jupiter, Juno and Minerva from three separate cities into the Capitoline Temple at Rome.[277] The Temple of Castor is outfitted with foundations of possible Greek influence, and while it has strong roots in Central Italic architectural and religious tradition, Romans' use of Greek architects could

[275] On the introduction of the cult of the Dioscouri in Rome in the late sixth century and its Greek nature: I. Nielsen and B. Poulsen 1992, 46-47.
[276] Lavinium is famously the site of an inscription to the Dioscouri, and a cult to the twins at Tusculum purportedly dates to the early Archaic period: G. McCracken 1948, 1474-1476; Lavinium 1972, 3-5, 441-443. On the battle, see Livy II.21.12; Dion. VI.13; R. M. Ogilvie 1965, 286.
[277] On Juno Regina: Livy, V.21, V.23.7. On the Capitoline: J. Bayet 1969, 40.

indicate their desire to outshine cults at Tusculum and Lavinium with a monumental temple boasting connections to the Dioscouri's Greek homeland.

**Structures along the southwest landfill**

Northwest of the Temple of Castor there are few remains of archaic buildings. Gianfilippo Carettoni and Laura Fabbrizi argue they found an "impluvium" in peperino and cappellaccio in a sounding below the Basilica Julia, but only one wall remains and its precise date and reconstruction are unclear. At 11.5 masl, its elevation is almost a meter higher than the archaic pavement around the Temple of Castor.[278] The use of peperino and the higher elevation suggest it is later, and could be as late as the second century.[279] In a small sounding below this "impluvium," Fabbrizi also found various strata containing ashlar blocks in cappellaccio around 9.57 masl, near the elevation of the stone pavement of the Forum (Fig. 2.67).[280] Whether the ashlar blocks were part of that pavement or are foundations or walls of another building is unclear.[281] Within this trench archaeologists also found antefixes of silens' heads that probably belong to an early Temple of Saturn or some other monumental structure in the area; it is unlikely that they belong to the nearby Temple of Castor, as that building had full-bodied antefixes

[278] G. Carettoni 1961, 57.
[279] At 11.5 masl, it is equal in elevation to a second century Forum pavement. No remains were found that can date the structure with any certainty before the second century: G. Carettoni 1961, 57. Cf. E. Gjerstad 1953-1973, II.33, 80-81.
[280] G. Carettoni 1961, 59.
[281] It is even possible that they could be remains of the Forum embankment.

and the silen antefix is only a head. They could pertain to an archaic Temple of Saturn or another building in the area (Fig. 2.68). Archaeologists have not excavated far enough below the Basilica Julia to find any other archaic remains between the Temples of Castor and Saturn.

Literary sources tell of a Temple of Saturn in the west corner of the Forum in the early fifth century; they do not expound on the form of the temple or its size.[282] Gabriele Cifani suggests that three tuff walls that Gabriela Maetzke uncovered in the 1990s are foundations of the archaic temple (Fig. 2.69).[283] In overall form, the walls resemble the longitudinal foundations of the Capitoline Temple and Temple of Castor, and the material in the Saturn foundations is the same grey granular tuff used in the foundations of the other two temples; furthermore, at 2.5 m, the walls are the same width as the foundations in the Temple of Castor and are constructed similarly of headers and stretchers.[284] What is more, as it seems likely that the silen head antefix from below the Basilica Julia does not belong to the Temple of Castor, it must have accompanied a different substantial early-fifth-century building in the area. The Temple of Saturn would be a prime candidate. The correspondences and resulting hypothesis of a fifth-century temple are exciting and entirely possible, but eighteenth-century interventions in the foundations of the Temple of Saturn leave the early walls without stratigraphy or any

[282] e.g. Dion., VI.1 and Livy, II.21 suggest it was vowed and dedicated between 501 and 497. For further references: P. Pensabene*, et al.* 1984, 8-12.
[283] G. Cifani 2008, 109-111. On the excavations: G. Maetzke 1985, 173-178; G. Maetzke 1986, 378; G. Maetzke 1989, 73; G. Maetzke 1991, 60-66.
[284] The foundation walls of both temples are constructed by laying two headers and one stretcher in each course. On Saturn: G. Maetzke 1989, 69-72. On Castor: I. Nielsen and B. Poulsen 1992, 61-79.

secure date.[285] The individual tuff blocks are ca. 40 x 60 x 90 cm, roughly 10 cm deeper than the Capitoline and Castor blocks and others that date to the archaic period.[286] Cifani himself notes that their dimensions are closer to the Grotta Oscura blocks of the fourth century Servian wall, which suggests a much later date for the podium.[287] In the end, the foundations are not precisely datable. Whatever period they belong to, they indicate a hexastyle temple with a slightly expanded central intercolumniation, and the overall width measures close to 20 m.[288] The temple is over two-thirds the width of the Temple of Castor (ca. 27 m) and one can imagine it suitably balanced its near twin at the south end of the Forum. Both faced into the open plain, bordering the Vicus Iugarius and Vicus Tuscus, the two major arteries from the Tiber to the monumental city-center.

If the temple does not date to the archaic period, one of the altars in the area may. A short wall in grey tuff remains roughly three meters in front of the center intercolumniation of the Temple of Saturn below the arch of a staircase to the late-Imperial building (Fig. 2.70).[289] This may be remains of an early altar, and its maintenance within the sanctified area of Saturn even into the Empire as new temples were built around it suggests it was long sacred to the cult. Coarelli identifies another possible altar further east. His is the structure in grey tuff immediately to the west of the

---

[285] Maetzke states emphatically that there is no stratigraphy to date the walls: G. Maetzke 1985, 173-178; G. Maetzke 1986, 378; G. Maetzke 1989, 73; G. Maetzke 1991, 60-66.
[286] on the height: G. Maetzke 1989, 62.
[287] G. Cifani 2008, 111. While cappellaccio blocks do vary in dimensions throughout the archaic period, it is difficult to find monuments with blocks this size. This is by no means definitive proof against an early fifth century date, but it does raise some doubt.
[288] the 20 m estimation is based on the assumption that a fourth wall on the east side of wall 1 had the same intercolumniation as that between walls 2 and 3.
[289] F. Coarelli 1977, 215, n. 141.

*mundus* in the Forum, just northeast of the foot of the Clivus Capitolinus (Fig. 2.71).[290] Over 30 meters north of the Temple, this structure seems much too far to be the altar and may be remains of another archaic or early Republican building. In any case, literary sources insist that the northwest corner of the Forum was sacred to Saturn well before even the early years of the city, and the location and ancient material of each of these walls suggests one of them was an early structure sacred to the god.[291]

**Monumentalizing the ground**

Excavators of the Temple of Castor found that along with the new temple, Romans repaved the area in the immediate vicinity in stone for the first time. A burn layer between two undisturbed stone pavements included early-fifth-century fragments of the Temple's decoration and other inclusions dating after the early fifth century (Fig. 2.72).[292] The finds and correspondence of the slabs to the foundations of the temple indicate that the lower pavement dates to the early fifth century.[293] The stone is the same grey tuff that builders used in the temple foundations, its surface 10.85 masl on the northwest flank of the Temple in the area of the Vicus Tuscus. The same pavement is present in four more trenches on the east side of Temple of Castor, and archaeologists identify it in excavations at the Lacus Iuturnae, Arch of Augustus and Temple of Caesar

[290] F. Coarelli 1977, 215, n. 141, Pl. 211.
[291] For the ancient sources: P. Pensabene*, et al.* 1984, 8-12.
[292] I. Nielsen 1990, 89-104; I. Nielsen and B. Poulsen 1992, 39-40, 67-69, 75, 157.
[293] I. Nielsen 1990, 89-104; I. Nielsen and B. Poulsen 1992, 39-40, 67-69, 75, 157.

(see fig. 2.61).[294] On the east side of the Temple of Castor it is 11.70 masl; at the Temple of Caesar the pavement is also 11.70 masl and further up the Palatine slope at the Lacus Iuturnae it is 12.40 masl. Gjerstad identified the first stone pavement of the central Forum area in tuff slabs from stratum 18 of the "Equus Domitiani" excavations; this is ca. 10 masl (fig. 2.73).[295] His pavement corresponds in date to the Castor pavements and is probably part of the renovation.[296] One can therefore imagine that the stone pavement from the area of the Lacus Iuturnae, ca. 12.40 masl, sloped down past the Regia at ca. 11.7 masl and the west side of the Temple of Castor at ca. 10.85 masl to the middle of the Forum where it was 10 masl. The elevation of the new paved space is precisely equal to the height of the worst annual Tiber floods. With this new pavement, the entire Forum would have been free from all but the most drastic and infrequent inundations and was outfitted with its first permanent and monumental floor.

In the period between the initial reclamation project in the late-seventh century and the paving of the Forum in stone after ca. 500, Romans built no monumental architecture on top of the filled land; they monumentalized structures like the Comitium and Regia around the edges of the open communal space and finds of beaten earth floors and post-holes suggest modest buildings on top of the fill, but they seem to have had trepidations about serious construction on top of the artificial central area. Finally,

---

[294] I. Nielsen 1990, 89-104; I. Nielsen and B. Poulsen 1992, 39-40, Pl. 11.
[295] E. Gjerstad 1953-1973, II.33, 44. The elevation is recalibrated as above, see notes 112.
[296] E. Gjerstad 1953-1973, II.58-59, 73-74. He dates the stratum to 450, but this is on dubious grounds; the best date is provided by the ceramics in the fill, none of which certainly dates later than ca. 510/500. A *terminus post quem* then of ca. 510/500 seems appropriate for this pavement.

just after 500, Romans monumentalized the floor of the Forum in stone and erected the Temple of Castor directly on top of the southern part of the fill. This first major construction on the site marks Romans' acceptance of its viability as both prominent and structurally sound real estate. Where previously unease had checked monumental construction and the filled land had supported only modest development, it was now the site of major monuments. Only after this did Romans begin building in the stretches of filled land between the Temples of Castor and Saturn and the Comitium and house at the Sepulcretum. In this light, the new pavement becomes the architectural signifier of Romans' recognition of the stability of the Forum landscape. As such, the pavement not only provided Rome's city center with a more permanent and monumental floor, it also indicates Romans' pride in the space and their recognition of the artificial plain between the Palatine and Capitoline as an extraordinary part of their city. One might even suggest that the laying of the stone pavement along with the monumentalization of the Comitium, Regia, Temple of Castor and perhaps temple of Saturn in the early fifth century indicates the earliest point at which one can call this area the Forum.

**Infrastructure**

At precisely the same time that Romans began monumentalizing the Forum, they laid roadways for at least two of the major streets into the Forum: the Vicus Tuscus and Sacra Via. In recent excavations between the Regia, Atrium Vestae and to the east and in earlier excavations through the area, archaeologists found grey tuff paving stones similar

in size to those used at the Temple of Castor and center of the Forum.[297] The remains date sometime between the mid sixth and early fifth centuries and comprise several frequently interrupted stretches of a road leading down a natural concavity between the Palatine and Velia (Fig. 2.74). [298] In the early-mid sixth century Romans filled a deep crevice at the nadir of this valley and later laid the grey tuff slabs on top of the fill; the road is east of a set of stone walled houses on the north slope of the Palatine and continues down to the Forum between the Regia and house over the *Sepulcretum*.[299] Though at this time it was little more than a two-meter-wide path into the Forum, the Sacra Via would eventually host the triumphal procession and became one of the most ceremonially important roads in the city.[300] Nearby between the Regia and Atrium Vestae, Romans also paved a previously gravel-survaced roadway in the late sixth century and paved a street much higher up the Palatine, at 15.35 masl, also in cappellaccio.[301] To the west, opposite the Temple of Castor, the Vicus Tuscus soon joined the infrastructure of the city-center. The same excavations at the temple that found the Forum pavement seems to have struck the early Vicus Tuscus. It is hard to distinguish pavement for the roadway from the public square, but the presence of an archaic stone pavement directly beneath the imperial basalt roadway of the Vicus Tuscus suggests that slabs between the

[297] T. Ashby 1899, 467; A. Carandini*, et al.* 1995 [2000], 73, 227; D. Filippi 2004b, 100-103.
[298] T. Ashby 1899, 467; A. Carandini*, et al.* 1995 [2000], 73, 227; D. Filippi 2004b, 100-103. The dating mechanism for these excavations has already been brought under question in the section on dates for the Comitium and Forum landfill and has been scrutinized by several archaeologists outside the team of excavators.
[299] A. J. Ammerman*, et al.* 1992, 107-138; A. Carandini*, et al.* 1995 [2000], 73, 227; D. Filippi 2004b, 100-103.
[300] F. Coarelli 1999, 223-228.
[301] R. T. Scott 2009, 10-11

Temple of Castor and later Basilica Julia pertain to the earliest paving of the street.[302] This roadway would remain a principal artery between the Tiber and the Forum well into the Empire and along with the Vicus Iugarius, itself possibly dating to the archaic period, it established one of the two only routes to the Forum from the west.[303]

**Undiscovered buildings around the major monuments**

No monumental archaic remains have been found under the basilicas Aemilia and Julia; while this could be due to the obliteration of early monuments during the construction of the mid-Republican basilicas, large soundings in the floors of both buildings recovered no indication of the presence of anything substantial.[304] Archaeologists have found no signs of structures like those under the late Republican Comitium, nothing like the walls found under the Regia or the terracottas and foundations of the Temple of Castor or the Temples at S. Omobono. The absence of monumental remains does at least suggest that Romans did not build on a monumental scale in these parts of their new space. No textual sources indicate buildings in these areas until the late fifth century.[305] As suggested above, the absence of monumental

[302] I. Nielsen 1990, 89-104; I. Nielsen and B. Poulsen 1992, 39-40, 67-69, 75, 157.
[303] E. Papi 1999, 195-196; P. Virgili 1999, 169-170.
[304] T. Ashby 1901, 136-138; G. Carettoni 1948, 111-118; G. Carettoni 1961, 53-60. The exception being the course of stone under the Basilica Julia, but this is hard to interpret.
[305] Carandini reconstructs Tarquinius Superbus' tabernae in the area of the Basilica Julia, but Livy does not provide a location for these tabernae, so they are not currently possible to locate with precision: A. Carandini*, et al.* 1995 [2000], Pl. IX. Ancient sources give no clear location for the Temples of Venus Cloacina and Janus, and no archaeological remains were

buildings between the Comitium and the archaic structure on the Sepulcretum and between the Temple of Castor and the Altar or Temple of Saturn indicate Romans' initial distrust of the landfill's stability; it may also reveal a more recent conception of the land as historically, religiously and politically important space. The Temple of Castor had to be built beside the Lacus Iuturnae, as that was where the Dioscouri had allegedly appeared.[306] The Lacus was purportedly ancient already in the archaic period. Archaeological evidence indicates the longstanding occupation of the Regia and Atrium Vestae, and Ammerman has demonstrated that the area of the Comitium was already in use before its first paving. Tradition suggests that the *Ara Saturni* was one of the most ancient sites in Rome. These spaces had been sacred before they were monumentalized and they were all in use prior to the landfill project.[307] They had history, and so they were primed for architectural elaboration. The space between these monuments in the area of the fill had long been unusable for its low elevation; the reclamation project created new land without lore or history. The space did not lend itself to significant construction because there were no established institutions that demanded monumentalization. The new platform did, however, provide new real estate and the lack of large-scale monuments should not suggest a complete absence of architecture. Literary evidence for prominent Republican houses and shops on the Forum and the possible archaeological evidence of an atrium dating between the late-archaic and mid-

---

found in excavations below the Imperial iterations of the temples. See above, "The Monuments and the Stage: structures along the northeast landfill."

[306] Dion., VI.12.1-2; Plut. *Aem,* 25.1-2; Plut. Cor., 3.4. For more on the sources, see I. Nielsen and B. Poulsen 1992, 46.

[307] See above, "before the reclamation"

Republican periods may indicate maturity of the site's early function. Certainly by the late sixth and early fifth centuries the spaces must have been inhabited to some degree, and beaten earth floors and post-holes under the Temple of Caesar suggest the character of adobe buildings that may have stretched between more prominent structures.

## V. The stage set

By the end of the archaic period, the Roman Forum was a prominent space boasting an expansive stone pavement, monumental temples, civic buildings and well established infrastructure (Fig. 2.75). In the east corner a stuccoed and terracotta building sat opposite the Regia on the Via sacra, the two buildings flanking one's entry from the Palatine. To the south Romans monumentalized the Atrium Vestae and in the south corner the Temple of Castor rose high above the Forum on a tall podium asserting Rome's new splendor and its power over Latin neighbors. Already by now, the colossal Temple of Jupiter loomed on the Capitoline Hill over the north end of the Forum with the Temple or Altar of Saturn at its base. At the north corner the Comitium had been transformed into a stage for sacred and political events. Between these structures smaller houses or shops may have marked the perimeter of a central plain, paved in stone. At the west, a retaining wall must have buttressed the immense fill that sustained this vast area high above the Velabrum. Issuing from either end of the wall, two roads, perhaps already known as the Vicus Tuscus and the Vicus Iugarius led to the west slopes of the

Palatine and Capitoline Hills, to the area of the Circus Maximus, to the Temples at S. Omobono, and eventually to the Tiber and the Mediterranean. Romans had created the Forum Romanum and it assumed the monumental image and prominent civic role that Romans would perpetuate for the coming 800 years. Only after the fourth century CE would the area cease to be the political, religious and architectural focus of the city.[308]

**Implications of the change for the city in the archaic period and beyond**

By the early fifth century, the Forum's civic and religious importance was clear; some of its buildings were not only monumental structures, they were crucial offices of the state and among the most fundamental religious sites in the city's history. From the start of the Republic, the Comitium was both the practical and the symbolic focus of the government of the city; it was the meeting and voting place of magistrates and would serve this function throughout the Republic and Empire. With the supposed installation of the Twelve Tables on the Rostra at the site of the Comitium around 450, the north corner of the Forum assumed the role of Rome's political center. At the other end of the Forum the Regia, perhaps the seat of the kings and eventually the seat of the *rex sacrificalis* and Pontifex Maximus may from its origins have been the center of religious powers in Rome; next door, the Atrium Vestae is archaeologically attested as one of the oldest cult spaces in the city and was throughout Roman history considered the center of Rome's most pure and ancient religious origins. The Comitium and Regia/Atrium Vestae

[308] On the last major building programs in the area: M. Cullhed 1994, ch. 3.

complex anchored the religious and political life of Rome at either end of the Forum from the archaic period to the Empire, and by monumentalizing them early on, Romans highlighted them as visually striking and enduring offices. The Ara Saturni and the subsequent temple would both proclaim Herakles' legendary founding of the city, further establishing the most ancient history of Rome in the Forum,[309] and the Temple of Castor would for the rest of Rome's ancient history serve as a meeting place for senators and a reminder of Rome's early control over Latium and the surrounding area.

The transformation and monumentalization of the Forum Valley signifies not only an irrevocable impact on the city's topographical future, but also a fundamental shift in the social organization of the people of Rome. No city of insignificant means or disorganized government could achieve such a colossal transformation of its geography, infrastructure and public architecture. In order to organize the reclamation of the space between the Palatine and Capitoline, Rome's leaders must have been able to organize vast manpower and production infrastructure, from quarrying and transportation to design and construction. Furthermore, to commit its energy to this kind of project, the community must have had considerable excess time and manpower; this indicates a momentous shift in social organization and community interests. Material evidence for Rome before the reclamation, including individual burials, small private structures and a lack of evidence for communal buildings or infrastructure, suggests a people with

[309] For arguments that the Herakles myth was already alive in the archaic period, see Chapter 2 and T. P. Wiseman 2008.

personal or family wealth, but not a community of resources. Burials at the base of the Palatine and Capitoline dating from the Orientalizing period down to ca. 650-625 indicate personal distinction, but until the landfill project, Rome exhibits no major community affluence or infrastructure. The eighth and seventh century walls on the Palatine may suggest a community endeavor, but if they are in fact city walls, they would have been necessary projects for the protection of the city. The reclamation and monumentalization of the Forum was by no means necessary: helpful, beneficial, yes, but not vital. A building like the Temple of Castor is only present in a city of means; the same is true of the elaborate buildings evidenced by terracottas at the Regia or the monumental stone platform of the Comitium. Perhaps Romans did in fact build the voting platform there at the start of the Republic in a symbolic gesture of the transition of power; this underscores that even after turmoil, the city had excess wealth, a resource that is not evident before the start of the reclamation project.

The transformation was not instantaneous, nor was it done in isolation from the rest of the city, but the reclamation of the Forum seems to have instigated a sea change for Rome, and more monumental projects followed immediately afterward. Around 625, perhaps as builders paved the Comitium for the first time, the area of S. Omobono shows the first signs of cult activity, possibly with the construction of a hut structure for worship (Fig. 2.76).[310] At the same time, Romans built the first version of the Regia at the south end of the Forum and it seems the Atrium Vestae was first equipped with a sacellum. The image of the city was still small in scale, not on the same grand level as the

[310] See chapter 2.

earliest, contemporaneous buildings at Murlo or Acquarossa, nor were burials as lavish and monumental as those at Cerveteri and Praenestae; nonetheless, Romans were beginning to make something of the major sites in their city. Between 580 and 570 Romans seem to have made another pass at the urban landscape, furthering monumentalizing the Regia with its first terracotta roof and revetments; the project shows a clear stylistic link to Campania and may, as Nancy Winter has suggested, demonstrate a political and social link between Italic Greek sites and Rome (Fig. 2.77). Such contact demonstrates one of the earliest examples of Romans reaching beyond their local community in an attempt to enhance their architecture and the image of their city. Around the same time Romans built the first temple at S. Omobono; as I establish in the following chapter, its earliest sculpture betrays a clear and powerful connection to eastern Mediterranean stylistic and cultural interest. Meanwhile Romans seem to have paved the Comitium for a second time adding the cippus and its pavement, the first adornment of the site. The inscription on the cippus indicates the site's ritual significance and so its prominence at the opposite end of the Forum from the newly rebuilt Regia. Between 530 and 500 Romans transformed the Forum and the fundamental scale of their urban image (Fig. 2.78). While building houses of stone on the Palatine slopes Romans laid the pavement of the Via Sacra and rebuilt the Regia yet again.[311] As will be seen in Chapter Two, a second temple at S. Omobono surpassed the first with more elaborate sculptural decoration that again seems to combine local religious and artistic traditions with foreign inspiration, and looming high above the work

[311] A. Carandini*, et al.* 1995 [2000], 215-282; A. Carandini*, et al.* 2006, 72-98, 103-114.

in the Fora Boarium and Romanum, Romans built the Capitoline Temple, a colossal structure of combined Greek and Italic design that took the stage as the sixth largest temple built in the archaic Mediterranean.[312] Within the next twenty years, Romans endorsed the prominence of the Forum with a new stone pavement. At the same time they built a temple to Castor and Pollux, overshadowing the cult's other, older sanctuaries at Tusculum and Lavinium with a monumental building matched by few others in Central Italy in its size and grandeur. Neighboring the new temple Romans once again reconstructed the Regia, this time with a plan that may indicate significant and direct ties to Athens.

Many of these monuments demonstrate Romans' desire and ability to look beyond local traditions in their new architecture. Scholars insist that the execution of complex tectonics or the incorporation of large, prominent architectural sculpture requires prolonged contact.[313] The cippus at the Comitium is of Grotta Oscura, indicating Rome's ability to harvest or acquire modest amounts of stone from quarries presumably under Veientine control; petrographic analysis of roof tiles from the Temple of Castor and elsewhere indicate a foreign clay source and probably manufacture.[314] The use of resources from outside their city suggests Rome's growing reach into neighboring lands. The incorporation of new styles, iconographies and tectonic principles popular in architecture from further afield signals more profound contact with the wider archaic Mediterranean. The plan of the foundations of the Temple of Castor, if

[312] Chapter 3.
[313] D. Mertens 1994, 203.
[314] A. J. Ammerman*, et al.* 2008, 22.

Greek in inspiration, are not part of the image of the city since they were not visible; they instead indicate something more subtle. Romans were not depending on Greek style; they were maintaining contact with Greeks in order to execute large-scale projects. The situation is even clearer in the Capitoline Temple. In the Regia, two phases evidence an interest in non-native architectural styles and iconographies. The gorgon antefixes and feline revetments belong to a Campanian style that scholars believe may have been manufactured in the Bay of Naples. Transporting and reconstructing such a large roof indicates extensive culture contact. When rebuilt in the early fifth century, the stone Regia had a trapezoidal plan that recalls a similar building in Athens. If connected, the similar architectural styles in buildings built in analogous political situations suggests a profound link between the two cities and their developing democracies.

The transformation and monumentalization of the Forum records best Rome's gradual and dramatic transition from a nucleated, if stable, city to a cohesive one of enormous power. The scale of the reclamation and the outfitting of the plain with a stone pavement, roadways and monuments with lavish terracotta ornamentation situates Rome amongst Central Italy's greatest cities. The resources required for these projects and their combination of local and foreign styles demonstrate a new kind of excess and intercultural exchange. What is more, the reclamation and monumentalization of this artificial urban space stands at the front of a fundamental shift in Rome's urban image. Here Romans first transform their landscape; here they begin monumentalizing their public architecture; here they first use forms and styles from beyond neighboring communities.

# Chapter 3

## The riverside sanctuary at S. Omobono and the mixing of foreign and local culture

The reclamation of the Forum and subsequent monumentalization of architecture there indicates a growing power and wealth at Rome and the reorganization of urban topography to exploit the benefits of the Tiber. Many of the buildings also illustrate cultural interaction between Rome and the greater Mediterranean. Yet it is difficult to see in projects there a *mode* of interaction, to perceive a genesis of culture contact or to understand *how* foreign and local cultures mixed. For markers of Rome's initial interaction with the wider Mediterranean world and for evidence of a gateway between foreign cultures and the growing city, one must look to the riverside sanctuary at S. Omobono.[315] No other site in Rome better reveals the initial stages and subsequent breadth of the influx of foreign crafts, ideas, material goods and luxury, nor does any other site so clearly indicate how Romans fused them with their own traditions and needs. At S. Omobono, every manner of evidence coalesces at one sanctuary to demonstrate pervasive culture contact and wealth. The sanctuary not only boasts innovative terracottas and architectural design, but also votives of many kinds: painted ceramics, bronzes, ivories, and substantial coroplastic sculptures in a multicultural blend of style and iconography. As a whole, the objects indicate that the sanctuary hosted

[315] On the proximity of the sanctuary to the River, see below, "urban context"

extensive contact between Romans and merchants traveling past and stopping in the city, contact that resulted in profound artistic exchange.

Despite abundant evidence from the site, scholars do not routinely highlight the cultural mixing present at S. Omobono or its influence on Rome's architectural history;[316] this is largely due to a poor record of publication: no synthesis of the site's full diachronic change has been published and one can only get a sense of the buildings, sculpture and votive record by piecing together often-convoluted excavation reports.[317] In this chapter I assemble evidence for the sanctuary and argue that three temples built successively on the site hold the key to understanding Rome's early cultural dynamism and the city's tremendous architectural and political growth in the archaic period. Because the site is so poorly published, I will begin with a systematic examination of archaeological evidence for each phase, and after presenting that evidence, discuss the dates of each phase. With the chronology and site development in place, I will discuss the significance of the structures for early Rome.

---

[316] Exceptions include Anna Mura Sommella, Ingrid Edlund-Berry and Nancy Winter, but like so much scholarship on early Rome, their work is primarily used by Etruscologists, not by Romanists.

[317] In new explorations through The Universities of Michigan and Calabria archaeologists are reevaluating the site and its artifacts; the study promises a new understanding of the sanctuary. The catalogue of an exhibition on the site is the only extensive report; it only covers the first two temples, excludes architectural sculpture and divorces architecture from votive finds, disrupting a comprehensive image of the site: Il viver quotidiano in Roma arcaica: materiali degli scavi del Tempio Arcaico nell'area sacra di S. Omobono 1989. Colonna's examination of the first two temples is primarily architectural: G. Colonna 1991. Cristofani and Mura Sommella focus on sculpture to the near exclusion of the architecture: M. Cristofani 1977; M. Cristofani 1981; M. Cristofani 1981; M. Cristofani 1990; A. Mura Sommella 1977; A. Mura Sommella 1981; A. Mura Sommella 1993; A. Mura Sommella 2000a. Others focus on votives: P. Virgili 1977; P. Virgili 1990; G. Pisani Sartorio 1977; G. Pisani Sartorio and P. Virgili 1979; G. Pisani Sartorio 1982.

## I. Archaeology of the site

### Excavation overview

Primarily under the supervision of Antonio Colini, thirteen formal excavations undertaken between 1934 and 1985 led to the discovery of several temples and other structures at the site around the church of S. Omobono on the south slope of the Capitoline Hill in Rome.[318] In 1934, archaeologists uncovered a large platform supporting remains of twin temples and altars oriented to the south; the platform is bordered to the north by a road identified as the Vicus Iugarius and to the east by a spur of that road heading into the center of the ancient Forum Boarium (Figs. 3.1–3.2). The twin temples occupy the northern two-thirds of the platform, and the church of S. Omobono is situated over the eastern temple's cella. Because it was part of Mussolini's plan to modernize Rome, the dig was not scientifically published and the site remained largely uninvestigated until the late 1950s when Gjerstad renewed work south of the apse

[318] A. M. Colini 1938; E. Gjerstad 1953-1973, III.378-456; A. M. Colini 1959-1960; G. Colonna 1959-1960; R. Paribeni 1959-1960; G. Ioppolo 1971-1972; A. Mura Sommella 1977; P. Virgili 1977; A. M. Colini*, et al.* 1978; G. Pisani Sartorio and P. Virgili 1979; G. Pisani Sartorio 1982; P. Virgili 1988; Il viver quotidiano in Roma arcaica: materiali degli scavi del Tempio Arcaico nell'area sacra di S. Omobono 1989; P. Virgili 1990; G. Ioppolo 1998; A. M. Colini*, et al.* 2000, 99-107, 173.

of the church.[319] During excavation he discovered two archaic temple podia (one on top of the other) and a host of archaic ceramics deep within the earthen fill of the twin-temple platform; the finds led to a flurry of activity, as archaeologists sunk eight new trenches over the coming two decades (Fig. 3.3). From 1962-4, Colini and Ioppolo excavated two trenches (II and IV) south of Gjerstad's, recording a staircase and an altar founded at the same elevation as the base of Gjerstad's early archaic temple podium and built of the same material.[320] From 1974-9, Giuseppina Pisani Sartorio and Paola Virgili, again under Colini's direction, excavated one trench east of Ioppolo's (I) and another (the first outside the twin temple platform) east of Gjerstad's (VII, IX).[321] Along with a trove of architectural terracottas, they found more of the earliest temple podium and a staircase pertaining to the second temple podium. Other excavations in the area, one from 1961-2 at the center of the twin temple platform and two others carried out in 1964 and 1985, found no more remains of archaic structures, but did help clarify dates for later Republican phases of construction on the site.[322] Overall, six trenches in the southeastern part of the twin-temple platform yielded remains of podia and walls for two archaic temples, fragments of terracottas belonging to them, and votive deposits pertaining to the sanctuary.

---

[319] Selected remains from the excavation were published in A. M. Colini 1938; E. Gjerstad 1953-1973, III.426-448; A. M. Colini 1959-1960; G. Colonna 1959-1960; R. Paribeni 1959-1960.

[320] G. Ioppolo 1971-1972.

[321] A. Mura Sommella 1977; P. Virgili 1977; A. M. Colini*, et al.* 1978; G. Pisani Sartorio and P. Virgili 1979; G. Pisani Sartorio 1982; Il viver quotidiano in Roma arcaica: materiali degli scavi del Tempio Arcaico nell'area sacra di S. Omobono 1989; P. Virgili 1990.

[322] E.g. P. Sommella 1968; Il viver quotidiano in Roma arcaica: materiali degli scavi del Tempio Arcaico nell'area sacra di S. Omobono 1989.

Despite routine mention of the site's importance in scholarly literature, there is no full publication of any of these excavations. The 1977 and 1984 campaigns led to partial publication of stratigraphy and finds, but only a few images of individual strata and no full list or examination of ceramics. Pisani Sartorio provides a summary of the archaic phases, but does not reference excavation reports, making it difficult to distinguish hypothesis from fact.[323] Giovanni Colonna provides perhaps the most thorough and well referenced description of the site's development, but he is chiefly concerned with reconstructing plans of the two small temples.[324] In all, more than twenty archaeologists have published analyses of the excavations resulting in conflicting interpretations in reports scattered through journals, books and notebooks; the outcome is a disconnected record of strata, ceramics, masonry and other finds. Most secondary studies of the site therefore match a few major finds with a basic outline of the site's diachronic change, leaving its overall image and significance unaddressed. Yet the data is surprisingly coherent and allows for a clear if fragmentary picture of the site. In an attempt to provide a framework for studying the sanctuary, I begin this chapter with an analysis of the phases of use at S. Omobono, looking at remains from the earliest anthropic levels to the late archaic period.

**Phase I – before the temples**

[323] G. Pisani Sartorio 1982; G. Pisani Sartorio 1990.
[324] G. Colonna 1991.

The first phase of human use comprises several strata of material; together they indicate increasing (though nominal) architectural development and early religious use. Gjerstad identifies five layers containing ceramics, bones, carbon remains and dense clay deposits (Fig. 3.4-3.5).[325] Based on these finds, he argues that the lowest two strata are early levels of human site-use, and that in the next two strata more plentiful finds and a thick layer of carbon, bucchero and dense clay evidence more consistent and organized occupation, including wattle-and-daub huts; a final, fifth stratum of beaten-earth indicates a thoroughly organized use of the site.[326] Pisani Sartorio, Virgili and Ioppolo found similar layers in excavations southeast of Gjerstad's trench.[327] Gjerstad had been unsure whether his beaten-earth layer was the last pre-temple occupation level or simply preparation for the foundations of the first temple, but Virgili and Pisani Sartorio discovered that the foundation trench for the first temple cuts the beaten-earth, suggesting the temple was part of a separate, later activity (Fig. 3.6).[328] What is more, excavations found a concentration of organic finds atop the beaten-earth layer and below an altar that accompanied the first temple, indicating that the earthen pavement had a life before the altar and first temple. The ashes and remains on top of the pavement (below the later altar) are of particular interest because they include copious remnants of goats as well as pigs, sheep and cows—*sus*, *ovis*, *taurus*—and suggest the area below the altar had

[325] E. Gjerstad 1953-1973, III.381, 386.
[326] Sector A-B, strata 15-20; sector B-C, strata 16-20; sector A-D, strata 16-20: E. Gjerstad 1953-1973, III.381, 386.
[327] G. Ioppolo 1971-1972, 8, fig. 1, Pl. 8; P. Virgili 1977, 30-33.
[328] G. Pisani Sartorio and P. Virgili 1979, 42-43.

been a stage for sacrifice.[329] Along with these organic finds, archaeologists discovered several small terracotta roof tiles on the beaten earth layer, indications of an early wooden structure on the site, perhaps below the first stone temple podium.[330]

Gjerstad and Pisani Sartorio highlight the wattle-and-daub huts and pavement as evidence of a gradual organization of the site. Gjerstad's evidence for the huts comes from a thick clay deposit which to him indicated ruined walls. Though scholars have found neither wattle-and-daub fragments nor post holes, many uphold Gjerstad's opinion.[331] Yet at seven masl, the site is far below the flood level of the Tiber, and as in the Forum, wattle-and-daub walls would have been routinely submerged in standing water. Ioppolo describes multiple thin "lenses" (6-7 mm strata) covering burned organic material in the topmost of the pre-temple layers; these are common signs of frequent flooding and further indicate seasonal inundation.[332] If the clay deposit does indicate walls for huts, their existence must have been short-lived.

[329] G. Ioppolo 1971-1972, 43; G. Pisani Sartorio and P. Virgili 1979, 42; Il viver quotidiano in Roma arcaica: materiali degli scavi del Tempio Arcaico nell'area sacra di S. Omobono 1989, 30-31, Pl. III.
[330] Il viver quotidiano in Roma arcaica: materiali degli scavi del Tempio Arcaico nell'area sacra di S. Omobono 1989, 30-31.
[331] E.g. G. Ioppolo 1971-1972, 8, fig. 1, Pl. 8; P. Virgili 1977, 30-33.
[332] G. Ioppolo 1971-1972, 12. Also, in the store rooms from the excavations is a whole apple found in the layers around the first two temples. Such organic material could not have survived unless it was in a substantially wet environment, including repeated flooding. The apple was made known to me by Nicola Terrenato, whose team is currently studying finds from old excavations.

Ceramics from the strata date from the eighth to late seventh or very early sixth centuries, indicating site occupation starting in the late eighth century.[333] The precise function of the area during these early years is unclear, but the escalation of finds, especially burned organic remains below the later altar, suggests the site's increased use as a sacred precinct. The possible existence of a wooden building on the site immediately before the first temple phase suggests a trend toward architectural articulation and a shift from open religious place to architecturally defined sanctuary.

**Phase II – temple I, construction and occupation**

Four trenches (excavated by three different archaeologists) have recovered portions of the first temple's podium and altar (Figs. 3.4–3.5, 3.7–3.9). Excavation in 1979 revealed the foundation trench cut into the earlier beaten-earth floor; within the trench ancient builders set a single course of foundations and capped it with five courses of stone creating a high podium.[334] The uppermost (fifth) course of the podium has a torus moulding, and on top of it excavators found a single course of stone, a footing for the temple's rear wall.[335] Gjerstad uncovered a partially demolished stretch of the same podium and wall socle, comprising the northwest corner and a section of the west face

[333] E. Gjerstad 1953-1973, III.396-398, 431-437; G. Pisani Sartorio and P. Virgili 1979, 42; Il viver quotidiano in Roma arcaica: materiali degli scavi del Tempio Arcaico nell'area sacra di S. Omobono 1989, 30-31, Pl. III.
[334] G. Pisani Sartorio and P. Virgili 1979, 42-43.
[335] E. Gjerstad 1953-1973, III fig. 245; G. Pisani Sartorio and P. Virgili 1979, fig. 2; Il viver quotidiano in Roma arcaica: materiali degli scavi del Tempio Arcaico nell'area sacra di S. Omobono 1989, Pl. II.

of the temple.[336] South of Gjerstad's excavations, Ioppolo uncovered remains of the lowest two courses of the temple's front staircase; the first step is on the beaten-earth floor and corresponds in elevation to the first course of the podium; excavators uncovered the west and east extremities of the stair and record its width as 2.3 m (Fig. 3.10).[337] Ioppolo also found two courses of a stone altar approximately three meters southwest of the temple's staircase and axially aligned with it; here too archaeologists ascertained a width: 3.5 m (Fig. 3.11).[338] Overall, excavations reveal sides of the temple, along with the frontal staircase and accompanying altar. Given that the altar and stair share an axis, archaeologists suggest they were set along the axial center of the building. With this in mind, they hypothesize the temple's overall width from the known western edge of the podium (torus excluded) to the hypothesized eastern edge as 10.6 m. Given the depth and height of each of the steps, they are also able to imagine that the staircase would terminate at the front of the temple podium 1.9 m to the north. A measurement from that point to the extant rear of the podium (again excluding torus) indicates a longitudinal measurement also of 10.6 m. The temple podium is built in *lionato* tuff of the Alban Hills, easily quarried from the nearby Capitoline Hill where it is abundant.[339] The inside of the podium was filled with earth largely free of debris.[340]

---

[336] G. Ioppolo 1966, 399-400 .
[337] Stratum 11: G. Ioppolo 1971-1972, 14; Il viver quotidiano in Roma arcaica: materiali degli scavi del Tempio Arcaico nell'area sacra di S. Omobono 1989, Pl. IV.
[338] Archaeologists identify this as an altar based on a heavy deposit of burned plant and animal remains: G. Ioppolo 1971-1972, 14, appendix II p. 43.
[339] G. Pisani Sartorio and P. Virgili 1979, 41.
[340] Sector A-B, stratum 13: E. Gjerstad 1953-1973, III.381.

In addition to remains of the podium, altar, stair and wall socle, archaeologists also identify a pavement and votive deposits associated with this first stone temple, indicating its protracted use. In his trench, Gjerstad records two thick beaten-earth floors, relating to each of the first and second temples. The surface of the lower floor is several millimeters below the base of the second temple podium, and so Gjerstad states it could not pertain to it (Fig. 3.4).[341] Other excavations found a similar thick pavement at the front and rear of the first temple at a similar elevation.[342] As to votives, it is difficult to distinguish objects that pertain to temple I; many pieces are atop the first pavement, but since there is no destruction layer covering the first temple, there is nothing to prove they do not pertain to the second temple. Still, throughout the excavations, workers found ceramics dating from the seventh to sixth centuries alongside bones, carbon and other organic materials; most scholars believe that at least some of these belong to the use of Temple I.[343]

**Phase III – Temple II, construction and occupation**

There is no evidence of destruction by fire in the strata between the first and second temple, and so it is unclear whether the first temple was destroyed in some manner (flood?) or simply replaced. For Temple II, builders dug a trench around the first

[341] Sector B-C, stratum 15: E. Gjerstad 1953-1973, III.385.
[342] Stratum 11: G. Ioppolo 1971-1972, 8, Pl. I; Stratum 8: G. Pisani Sartorio and P. Virgili 1979, 42 and figs. 42-43.
[343] G. Ioppolo 1971-1972, 8, 11-12; P. Virgili 1977, 30-32.

temple and sunk a single course of undressed stone as foundation; on top of this they laid a podium with a double round moulding (Figs. 3.4–3.5).[344] The podium is present only in Gjerstad's excavations of the west face and northwest corner of the temple; there it is capped with two courses of stone: a footing for the temple wall. Though the podium was not uncovered elsewhere, Pisani Sartorio excavated a set of stairs east of the altar of the first temple, and she ascribes them to the second temple (Figs. 3.12–3.13). The new stairs are parallel to the stairs of the first temple, and on top of the new steps archaeologists found two blocks of stone similar in size to those topping the second temple podium in Gjerstad's trench (Fig. 3.12, d). What is more, the two courses atop the staircase are at the same elevation as those from Gjerstad's excavation.[345] In light of the correspondence, Colonna confirms Pisani Sartorio's suggestion that they belong to the second temple and that the two courses of stone at the top are the socle of the temple's eastern anta (Fig. 3.14).[346] Based on these finds, Ioppolo reconstructs the podium of the second temple as 1.6 m tall, and based on Colonna's calculations, it is 11.2 m wide x 13.2 m long.[347] His width assumes the second temple shares the axis of the first, along the altar, which was reused; his length is based on a measurement from the rear of the first temple podium (and the assumption that the second temple also

[344] Sector A-B-C, 13-14: E. Gjerstad 1953-1973, III.384-385. On the moulding: I. E. M. Edlund-Berry 2008, 442; cf. L. S. Meritt and I. E. M. Edlund-Berry 2000, 83-84. For more on the significance, see below.
[345] Cf. Il viver quotidiano in Roma arcaica: materiali degli scavi del Tempio Arcaico nell'area sacra di S. Omobono 1989, Pl. II; G. Colonna 1991, fig. 3.
[346] G. Colonna 1991, 52. He follows others who had suggested something similar: A. M. Colini*, et al.* 1978, 430.
[347] G. Colonna 1991, 52-53.

terminated there) to the front of the anta wall at the top of the second temple's stair.[348] Again, the podium is made of *lionato* tuff and is filled with earth.[349]

Evidence for the second temple's use is more substantial than the first; it has a new pavement and striking votive finds. Gjerstad identifies a rammed-earth floor around the base for the second temple, its surface nearly flush with the top of the undressed course of stone below the podium's double round.[350] Ioppolo, Virgili and Pisani Sartorio found a similar thick pavement of clay at the rear and front of the temple at that level, suggesting the single pavement was consistent throughout the site.[351] At the rear of the temple, where archaeologists have not found traces of the second temple podium, this pavement is present along the side of the first temple podium and is not present inside that podium; this has indicated to scholars, including Pisani Sartorio and Colonna, that the first temple podium also served as the rear podium for the second temple.[352] Rich votive deposits pertaining to the second temple phase were first discovered in a trench dug into the twin temple podium during the unpublished excavations from 1937-8. North of the temple, beneath the apse of the Church of S. Omobono, archaeologists

[348] see next paragraph for discussion of the reused rear of the podium.
[349] Sector A-B, stratum 12: E. Gjerstad 1953-1973, III.381. For arguments that the second temple reused the rear podium of the first, see below.
[350] Sector B-C, stratum 14: E. Gjerstad 1953-1973, III.381.
[351] Stratum 12: G. Ioppolo 1971-1972, 8, Pl. 1; stratum 5: G. Pisani Sartorio and P. Virgili 1979, 42. Virgili and Pisani Sartorio record two numbers for this pavement, 6-7, but in their report they combine it as one activity.
[352] Colonna originally suggested the second temple was much longer, but later retracted that argument: G. Colonna 1985, 70; G. Colonna 1991, 52-53. Cf. stratum 5: G. Pisani Sartorio and P. Virgili 1979, 42.

found a deposit of Greek kylikes and other ceramics that pertain to the second temple.[353] Little is known about their context, but Gjerstad and Pisani Sartorio corroborate their assignation to the second temple.[354] Virgili and Pisani Sartorio's 1977 excavations also found a large number of votive objects in the area behind the temple.[355] Among them is an object that some characterize as a *tessera hospitalis*—an object carried by travelers and shown as a request for hospitality—in the shape of a lion engraved with the Etruscan name *araz silqetenas spurianas* (Fig. 3.15).[356] In excavations from 1974-5 archaeologists uncovered laminated male and female bronze figurines at the front of the temple; the figures are particular to north-central Latium.[357] Gjerstad also found ceramics and other votive remains flanking the west face of the podium in his excavations.[358] Overall, the

[353] E. Gjerstad 1953-1973, III.437; Il viver quotidiano in Roma arcaica: materiali degli scavi del Tempio Arcaico nell'area sacra di S. Omobono 1989, 46.

[354] It appears that the kylices and other objects were found below the burn layer (destruction) covering the second temple. This would mean they had to belong to the early phases of the site. The style of the ceramics, however, does not allow them to pertain to the first temple or earlier: they are Attic late sixth century. For more on the dates of the ceramics and the temple phases, see below.

[355] Il viver quotidiano in Roma arcaica: materiali degli scavi del Tempio Arcaico nell'area sacra di S. Omobono 1989, 42-43. Adornato argues vehemently against this, suggesting the ceramics pertain to the first temple, but he is misinformed on his stratigraphy. He is under the impression that stratum 5 was the pavement for the second temple, but in fact it is the destruction layer of the second temple. Thus, even by his own argument, these finds pertain to temple II: G. Adornato 2003, 814.

[356] Whether the object had the same function as later Roman requests for hospitality is uncertain, but the carved ivory lion was certainly a precious object for someone to lay at the site. For more on the object, see below. M. Cristofani 1990, 21, 21.26; G. Adornato 2003, 814.

[357] Virgili and Pisani Sartorio suggest the objects from strata 19-20 pertain to the second temple phases: Il viver quotidiano in Roma arcaica: materiali degli scavi del Tempio Arcaico nell'area sacra di S. Omobono 1989, 45; cf. G. Pisani Sartorio 1977, 56; P. Virgili 1977, 30-31.

[358] Sector B-C, stratum 13: E. Gjerstad 1953-1973, III.384.

votives reveal that after the temple's construction visitors to the sanctuary surrounded it with local and foreign offerings of Etruscan, Latin and Greek provenance.

**Phase IV – destruction**

In all excavations of the site from 1938 to 1977 archaeologists found that a thick layer of clay covered the second temple podium, the altar and votives; on top of the clay layer was a thin burn layer containing abundant terracottas.[359] Scholars agree that these layers indicate the destruction of the temple, the clay from the first layer being the destroyed walls, and the burn layer evidence of the collapse of the burning roof and the spread of fire through the area.

**Phase V – leveling**

Covering the destruction layers archaeologists found 1-1.5 m of earth, sand and clay spread throughout the site in what scholars agree must have been an attempt to level

[359] Sector B-C, stratum 11-12 (burn layer) 13 (clay): E. Gjerstad 1953-1973, III.384; Stratum 5: G. Pisani Sartorio and P. Virgili 1979, 42; Strata 17 (burn layer) and 18-20 (treated separately, but one activity of clay and tuff fragments): P. Virgili 1977, 30-31; stratum 10 (burn) and 11 (clay): G. Ioppolo 1971-1972, 14. For the context of the 1938 excavations: Il viver quotidiano in Roma arcaica: materiali degli scavi del Tempio Arcaico nell'area sacra di S. Omobono 1989, 45.

the area (Fig. 3.4-3.5, strata 9-11; Fig. 3.8 strata 7-8; Fig. 3.16, strata 12-16).[360] In addition to earthen deposit, the strata include architectural terracottas and fragments of *lionato* tuff, the same material used in the first two temple podia and wall socles, a material not reused in future buildings on the site.

**Phase VI, terracotta deposit**

In the excavation of trench I, archaeologists found an isolated deposit of architectural terracottas covering the leveling strata (Fig. 3.16, strata 10-11).[361] The deposit was only present in the western part of the trench and continued beyond its western border, but does not appear in trench II, just 1 meter away. Recovered items include fragments of a revetment with a strigilated sima over a frieze of riders, a revetment with only the strigils remaining, fragments of a strigilated sima over alternating meander and squares surrounding stars, and other unidentified architectural terracottas of a similar type.[362] Archaeologists have suggested that Romans placed the terracottas

[360] Sector B-C, strata 9-11: E. Gjerstad 1953-1973, III.381; strata 12-16: P. Virgili 1977, 28-30; stratum 4 (treated as a single activity): G. Pisani Sartorio and P. Virgili 1979, 41; strata 7-10: G. Ioppolo 1971-1972, 8.
[361] See below, "dating remains of the temples."
[362] P. Virgili 1977, 28.

over the leveled site as a sign of the completed ritualized cleaning of a destroyed precinct.[363]

**Phase VII – the twin temple platform[364]**

During excavation of the first two temples, archaeologists also exposed some of the walls and pillars that make up the much larger twin-temple platform. In all, three excavations revealed parts of the perimeter wall of the platform and a pillar that supported one of the temple's columns (Figs. 3.9, 3.16, 3.17). During excavation of the two small temples, Gjerstad uncovered a four-meter-tall pillar under the apse of the Church of S. Omobono. It constitutes 10 courses of grey friable tuff (cappellaccio) that rise from the surface of the destruction layer directly over the northwest corner of the small temples to the top of the twin temple platform.[365] The top of the pillar is still visible underneath the apse of the Church (Fig. 3.18). In their excavations Virgili and Pisani Sartorio exposed the entire height of the east wall of the platform; it too is ten courses of cappellaccio totaling four meters of stone oriented directly north-south (Fig. 3.9).[366] During excavation in 1974, archaeologists discovered not only the east platform

[363] Il viver quotidiano in Roma arcaica: materiali degli scavi del Tempio Arcaico nell'area sacra di S. Omobono 1989, 45.
[364] Dates for this and the following phase are hotly debated, see below, "dating remains of the temples."
[365] Il viver quotidiano in Roma arcaica: materiali degli scavi del Tempio Arcaico nell'area sacra di S. Omobono 1989, Pl. II, IV. Gjerstad omits the profile of the pillar from his excavation sections (figs 3.4-3.5), but Ioppolo includes it in his composite of the excavations.
[366] G. Pisani Sartorio and P. Virgili 1979, fig. 2.

wall, but also its foundation trench (Fig. 3.16, strata 9).[367] The trench cuts the terracotta deposit and leveling layer, indicating that builders dug through those activities to lay the wall; it therefore postdates those activities, whether by a few years or by a century remains in question.[368]

From the Middle Republic through the Empire, Romans reconstructed the twin temples several times, on the cappellaccio platform, covering it with new pavements in tuff and travertine.[369] Due to its reuse, the platform remains largely intact and is visible in several places where the later superstructures have disappeared; an examination of its remains reveals a remarkably clear plan of foundations. The western, northern and eastern extremities of the platform are identifiable in the archaeological record. Colini notes that the rear (north) wall was never covered over with new material, and so the cappellaccio there is well preserved (Fig. 3.19-3.20).[370] He also records part of the western perimeter wall halfway along the west side of the platform (Fig. 3.21), and Virgili and Pisani Sartorio's excavations uncovered the eastern perimeter wall (Fig. 3.9).[371] Archaeologists have also identified cappellaccio substructures for the twin temple buildings. Of the western temple, the foundations for the cella remain visible beneath mid-Republican Fidene tuff walls, and the substructure supporting the eastern colonnade or ala wall is visible below later Republican and Imperial building materials (Fig. 3.22-

[367] P. Virgili 1977, 26-28.
[368] See below, "dating remains of the temples."
[369] I give the middle republican and imperial dates here because they are well established in scholarship; I have so far omitted dates for the other phases because they are problematic and I will discuss them below.
[370] A. M. Colini, *et al.* 2000, 102 (his page 195).
[371] A. M. Colini, *et al.* 2000, 99, (his p. 91).

2.23).[372] Colini also records two deep cappellaccio pillars a few meters in front of the cella walls; he and Ioppolo reconstruct these as supports for two columns in front of the longitudinal cella walls (Fig. 3.19). Of the eastern temple, remains of cappellaccio foundations are present below the west colonnade or ala wall, and archaeologists have uncovered a long stretch of a transverse cappellaccio wall under the Imperial frontal colonnade (Fig. 3.24). Also, Gjerstad uncovered the pillar in front of the temple's cella bellow the apse of S. Omobono (Fig. 3.18). In front of the two temples an enormous platform of solid cappellaccio is still visible in several places. Its surface is extant south of a later altar that fronted the eastern temple, and several courses of it are exposed between the later twin altars and in the area of the southwest corner of the platform (Fig. 3.25-3.27). These indicate an enormous quantity of stone laid for a solid platform in front of the twin buildings.

**Phase VIII – filling the platform and raising the site around it**

Returning to the excavations in the southeastern area around the first two temples, archaeologists found that after sinking foundation walls and pillars for the new twin temples, builders filled in the platform with an enormous quantity of earth and

[372] A. M. Colini*, et al.* 2000, Pl. VI. In the transverse and longitudinal section of the west temple, he shows it under the rear wall of the temple, under the front wall of the cella, under the two frontal columns of the temple (beneath the later Grotta Oscura reinforcements) and continuing down, throughout the solid platform in front of the temples.

debris in several layers (Figs. 3.3–3.4 strata 5–8; 3.8, strata 4–6; 3.16, strata 6–9).[373] By contrast, outside the platform, instead of separate layers of fill, builders used one single deep debris-free layer to raise the surrounding ground level, perhaps in preparation for a road (3.9, stratum 3).[374] Workers disturbed the top of this outside fill when laying another fill on top of it during reconstruction work in the middle Republic, so its original height is unknown.[375]

The fill within the twin temple podium has long struck archaeologists for its peculiar inclusions. They comprise finds that date from the sixteenth to the sixth centuries BCE, including ceramics of the Apennine culture dating from the fourteenth to thirteenth centuries.[376] Gjerstad notes that the fill must have been transported from elsewhere and dumped at the site of S. Omobono, and Ioppolo and Daminato agree, stating that dates for the strata are flipped, with the oldest material in the upper levels.[377] Archaeologists conclude that builders dug the fill from the nearby Capitoline and deposited it within the new temple platform. As they dug deeper into the Capitoline to retrieve more earth, they encountered older material, which was then deposited on top of the accumulating fill within the temple podium. In total, archaeologists calculate that the volume of the fill within the podium was approximately 30,000 $m^3$, an enormous volume

[373] Sector A-C, strata 5-8 and sector A-D, 5-8: E. Gjerstad 1953-1973, III.380, 384-385; strata 4-6: G. Ioppolo 1998, 8, 17; strata 6-9: P. Virgili 1977, 26-28.
[374] Stratum 3: G. Pisani Sartorio and P. Virgili 1979, 41, 43.
[375] Stratum 2: G. Pisani Sartorio and P. Virgili 1979, 41.
[376] L. Daminato 1977, 35; G. Pisani Sartorio 1977, 60; P. Virgili 1977, 26; cf. G. Ioppolo 1971-1972, 14 and sector A-D, stratum 5-8: E. Gjerstad 1953-1973, III.386.
[377] E. Gjerstad 1953-1973, III.386; G. Ioppolo 1971-1972, 17; L. Daminato 1977, 35.

that recalls the scale of construction involved in the leveling of the Forum.[378] On top of the fill workers paved the platform and built the twin temples; only scanty remains of these activities survive; I discuss them below.[379]

**Summary of later phases (IX-XII)**

At least four major phases of construction took place after the cappellaccio podium and temples on it. They include (1) a pavement in Monteverde tuff and perhaps a rebuilding of the temples, probably dating to the early fourth century, (2) Marcus Fulvius Flaccus' erection of a monument ca. 264 BCE, (3) a second pavement in Monteverde tuff and perhaps another rebuilding of the site after a fire in 213 BCE, and (4) the final Imperial reconstruction with a (much) higher travertine pavement and travertine columns.[380]

## II. Dating remains of the temples

With the exception of phases VII and VIII (the twin temple podium and fill) scholars agree on a rough chronology for archaic construction at S. Omobono, but

[378] G. Ioppolo 1971-1972, 17 with references.
[379] See below, "Imagining the Temples at S. Omobono."
[380] Some scholars believe the first Monteverde pavement accompanies the cappellaccio platform, which they date to Camillus' reconstruction ca. 396. On this, see below "dating remains of the temples." On later phases, see for example: G. Pisani Sartorio 1990, 114; P. Sommella 1968; on Flaccus: M. Torelli 1968.

tendentious arguments affiliating each building with a particular ruler of Rome or with the start or end of a trend in sculptural style have generated an intense debate over the exact date of each phase. The styles of the mouldings on the first two temple podia suggest rough dates, but cannot provide a precise chronology. In some cases, stratigraphy can help isolate phases from one another and even provide a solid *terminus post* or *ante quem* for a particular phase. Still, the site is not excavated widely enough or published in a capacity that allows any precision based on stratigraphy alone. A third class of evidence lends the greatest support to dating the buildings. In nearly every excavation of the site since 1938 archaeologists have unearthed architectural terracottas belonging to the temples. They have been found in destruction and fill layers from the levels just above the first temples to those incorporated into the fill of the twin temple podium. Many of these fragments were found in unrecorded contexts, so they cannot help date strata around the buildings; rather, their styles, iconographies and forms suggest dates for the terracottas themselves. When placed within the chronological framework that mouldings and strata provide, the terracottas can be associated with a particular building phase and help date the buildings with some precision.

**Mouldings and their dates**

Although no moulding survives from the twin temples or their platform, Temples I and II both retain mouldings that can provide a rudimentary framework for their dates. Edlund-Berry contends that the round moulding from Temple I finds its closest parallel

in a torus moulding from Satricum, Temple 0—the sacellum, which dates to ca. 550-540 (Figs. 3.6, 3.9, 3.28–3.29).[381] The simple single round on a vertical fascia is not present in temple podia or altars from the late sixth century onward, which suggests the S. Omobono moulding (and the temple) dates no later than the middle of the sixth century. As to the moulding of the second temple, Edlund-Berry suggests it is the first known double round in Central Italy, predating examples at Ardea and Tarquinia (Figs. 3.4, 3.8, 3.29).[382] Mura Sommella and Castagnoli note a similarity between the moulding of Temple II and the profile of Altar 13 at Lavinium.[383] The date of the altar is not certain, but probably earlier than 500; together with the Ardea temple, which scholars date between 500-490, it suggests a *terminus ante quem* of ca. 500 for Temple II at S. Omobono.[384] How long before 500 is unclear. The mouldings therefore provide a chronological outline of the two phases of construction: Temple I was built sometime in the mid sixth century or before, and Temple II was built sometime before 500.

**Finds in context, dating though stratigraphy**

Excavations at S. Omobono have produced hundreds of finds that help refine dates for each of the three temples, and in some cases the finds clarify when they were destroyed.

---

[381] I. E. M. Edlund-Berry 2008, 442.
[382] I. E. M. Edlund-Berry 2008, 442; when first writing on the moulding, Shoe Meritt was using Gjerstad's now discredited chronology to place it in the fourth century: L. S. Meritt and I. E. M. Edlund-Berry 2000, 83-84.
[383] A. Mura Sommella 1977, 65; cf. F. Castagnoli 1959-1960, 3; Shoe-Merritt dates the altar just within the sixth century L. S. Meritt and I. E. M. Edlund-Berry 2000, 100.
[384] G. Colonna 1984, 408.

For the first two temples, evidence comes from the excavations of 1959 to 1985. In strata below the first temple, archaeologist found bucchero, impasto, carbon, and a few architectural terracottas dating from the eighth to the early sixth centuries.[385] Of particular interest is a fragmentary five-letter inscription: the letters -*uqnus*- written in a Caeretan or Veientine alphabet constitute the earliest known Etruscan inscription in Rome and were found on an impasto vase just below layers relating to the first temple (Fig. 3.30).[386] An study of the inscription suggests a *terminus post quem* of ca. 600-590 for that temple.[387] The few remains assignable to the layers of occupation of the first temple do not further help date it, so based on the moulding it remains datable through the mid sixth century. The absence of a layer of destruction between the two temples renders it difficult (at present impossible) to determine a *terminus post quem* for the second temple through stratigraphy. What is more, finds from the occupation of the second temple do not help refine the *terminus ante quem*. They include ceramics and laminated bronze, amber and ivory figures that date as late as the end of the sixth century (Fig. 3.31-3.32).[388] This corroborates the date of the moulding, and a *terminus ante quem* of ca. 500 for the construction of Temple II. While the votives do not help date the creation of the second temple, along with objects from the destruction and burn layers, they do help

[385] L. Daminato 1977, 37-38; P. Virgili 1977, 32.
[386] M. Pallottino 1965, 505; cf. P. Virgili 1990, 130.
[387] M. Pallottino 1965, 505.
[388] Many objects could date to the last decade of the sixth century, but it is impossible to date them with precision: E. Gjerstad 1953-1973, III.437; G. Pisani Sartorio 1977, 56; Il viver quotidiano in Roma arcaica: materiali degli scavi del Tempio Arcaico nell'area sacra di S. Omobono 1989, 45-58; M. Cristofani 1990, 21; G. Adornato 2003, 814.

date its ruin. None of the objects found in these layers dates after the sixth century.[389] What is more, no object found in the leveling layers on top of the destruction (nor any from the deposit of terracottas on top of that) dates past the sixth century.[390] The inclusion in the occupation, destruction and leveling layers of materials dating to the last decade of the sixth century and the absence of any materials dating after 500 suggests that the destruction of the temple and leveling of the site occurred at the very end of the sixth century. Stratigraphy does, therefore, slightly refine the chronology of the first two temples: both date to the sixth century, and not before; the first temple was built sometime in the first two-thirds of the century, and the second temple was not only built in the second half of the century, but also burned close to the end of it.

As to the twin temple platform, stratigraphy is far more helpful in ascertaining a date. Scholars agree that the second temple fell around 500; but they are divided as to what this means for the twin temples. Some believe that the destruction of Temple II indicates the twin temple podium should date within the subsequent few decades; others contend that it must correspond to Camillus' reconstruction of the site in 396.[391]

Those who believe the platform belongs in the fourth century argue that the cappellaccio was used only as a foundation platform for the temples, and that the

---

[389] L. Daminato 1977, 39-40; S. Rizzo 1977, 44; G. Pisani Sartorio and P. Virgili 1979, 44, Virgili, 1977 #1442; P. Virgili 1990, 130.
[390] P. Virgili 1977, 27-28; G. Pisani Sartorio and P. Virgili 1979, 44.
[391] Those in favor of a fifth century date: A. M. Colini 1977, 16, 19; G. Colonna 1985, 70; Il viver quotidiano in Roma arcaica: materiali degli scavi del Tempio Arcaico nell'area sacra di S. Omobono 1989, 13; G. Pisani Sartorio 1990, 113. Contra: P. Sommella 1968, 65; T. J. Cornell 2000, 44; Other scholars believe the pavement dates even later: F. Coarelli 1988a, 214.

pavement for the sanctuary consisted of Monteverde slabs, many of which remain on the site (Fig. 3.33).[392] Since Monteverde is not used in Roman construction until the early fourth century, the cappellaccio platform (and the accompanying Monteverde pavement) would date no earlier than 400. Yet there is no stratigraphic or architectonic reason to tie the Monteverde slabs to the cappellaccio foundation; they could just as easily be part of a later reconstruction (and repaving) of the sanctuary. What is more, there is evidence of a pavement of the podium that predates the first Monteverde pavement, one that could have accompanied a cappellaccio platform built just after 500. Colini notes two pavements in Monteverde tuff at the west side of the platform (Fig. 3.21, Fig. 3.34). Scholars largely agree that the second (upper pavement) dates to a reconstruction of the area ca. 213, and that the first (lower pavement) dates to Camillus' building.[393] In excavations in front of the apse of the church in the eastern portion of the platform, Gjerstad states that he too uncovered evidence for two pavements. His top pavement is in Monteverde stones on a thin beaten-earth stratum. The bottom pavement is evidenced only by a layer of beaten earth, but it is identical to other such layers found throughout the city where pavement slabs have been removed (Fig. 3.4-3.5, strata II, IIA).[394] In the eastern portion of the site, where Gjerstad was excavating, the second (upper) Monteverde pavement is absent; there, only the first (lower) Monteverde

[392] E.g. P. Sommella 1968, 65; for a synthesis: T. J. Cornell 2000, 44.
[393] E.g. P. Sommella 1968, 65; P. Virgili 1988, 80; A. M. Colini*, et al.* 2000, 99 (his p. 91); Coarelli believes the first Monteverde pavement dates to ca. 284: F. Coarelli 1988a, 214.
[394] Sector A-B-C, and A-D, strata 1-2: E. Gjerstad 1953-1973, III.380, 384-385.

pavement remains.[395] If Gjerstad is to be believed, his upper pavement would be the first Monteverde floor, and an earlier pavement existed below it. Thus, the podium could have been built before the fourth century and paved in now-lost stone.

Regardless of Gjerstad's early pavement, it seems unlikely that the cappellaccio platform would date to the fourth century. As Colini notes, evidence is clear (and scholars agree) that the second temple fell around 500. If the cappellaccio platform and Monteverde tuff belong together and date to the early fourth century, this leaves the site in utter abandon for over one hundred years.[396] He doubts that Romans would leave so historic and prominent a religious site empty for that long.[397] Furthermore, atop the destruction and leveling layers that cover the second temple, builders deposited 30,000 $m^3$ of earth and debris to fill the inside of the platform and raise the area around it; in analyses of this fill archaeologists have discovered not one find dating to the fifth century or later.[398] Paribeni and Colonna published finds from the 1938 excavations and record nothing that dates after ca. 500.[399] In subsequent excavations archaeologists concluded that of the hundreds of Euboean, Pithecusan, Corinthian, Ionic and Attic wares, Italic

[395] G. Pisani Sartorio and P. Virgili 1979, fig.1; A. M. Colini*, et al.* 2000, 99 (his p. 91); confirmed on observation of the site: 11.20.2008.
[396] A. M. Colini 1977, 16, 19.
[397] One might cite the oath of Plataea as an example of similar abandonment of sanctuary at the start of the fifth century. Yet it is difficult to argue the S. Omobono case based solely on one comparandum. What is more, there is archaeological evidence of frequentation at the old Athena temple on the Acropolis during the 30 years before Perikles' reconstruction. As I discuss below, there is no such evidence for site use at S. Omobono, and this poses problems for the suggestion that the subsequent temple dates a century after the late archaic temple.
[398] Enea nel Lazio, archeologia e mito: bimillenario virgiliano (mostra a Roma 22 settembre-31 dicembre 1981, Campidoglio, Palazzo dei Conservatori) 1981, 115.
[399] G. Colonna 1959-1960, esp. 138; R. Paribeni 1959-1960, esp. 110.

impasto and bucchero in all of the strata from the destruction of the second temple to the top of the fill of the podium, not one fragment dates after the end of the sixth century.[400] If in the face of Colini's doubt, one were to suggest that Romans *could* have abandoned the site for a century in a move similar to the contemporaneous oath of Plataea at Athens, one must still contend with the absence of fifth century materials in the fill of the cappellaccio podium and all layers below it; it is hard to imagine that not one scrap of material culture would find its way into the site over the course of more than one hundred years of urban development and occupation around it.

In sum, there is strong stratigraphic evidence that the cappellaccio platform and foundations date not long after the end of the sixth century, and evidence for a now-lost cappellaccio pavement predating the first Monteverde pavement suggests a phase of construction before Camillus' victory of 396. Revetments from the temple confirm this chronology.

**Architectural terracottas and their dates**

Architectural terracottas from temples at S. Omobono have been the highlight of scholarship on the site since their initial discovery in the excavations of 1938. For the two small temples archaeologists have recovered sima revetments, water spouts, roof tiles, and large pedimental, acroterial and ridgepole sculptures. For the twin temples they

[400] G. Ioppolo 1971-1972, 17; L. Daminato 1977, 35-42; S. Rizzo 1977, 43-54; P. Virgili 1977, 26-28; A. M. Colini*, et al.* 1978, 424.

have found only a few revetments that might pertain to the sima. Overall the terracottas reveal a rich decoration for every phase of construction and help date the temples with some precision.

### *The small temples*

During excavation from 1974 to 1975 archaeologists uncovered multiple fragments of flat terracotta revetment plaques and two heraldic felines; these offer the best date for the first temple (Figs. 3.35–3.38).[401] The remains all come from the same context of ritually buried ceramics and are of the same fabric, leading scholars to suggest they are all part of decoration for the same temple.[402] Though their position on the temple was at first debated, Mura Sommella contends that they belong to a closed pediment composed of a painted, unsculpted terracotta backing with two sculpted felines near the center of the gable; most scholars now agree with her assessment.[403] Of late, Adornato is the only scholar to question the date of the lions and their ascription to the pediment of the first temple; he suggests heraldic felines are only common in Central

[401] A. Mura Sommella 1977, 83-90; A. Mura Sommella 1981; A. Mura Sommella 1990; A. Mura Sommella 2000a.
[402] On the ritual burial of the ceramics: above, notes 347-349.
[403] A. Mura Sommella 1977, 86; A. Mura Sommella 2000a, 13-14; cf. A. Giuliano 1981, 35; G. Colonna 1988b, 313; F. P. Arata 1990, 123; M. Mertens-Horn 1994, 272-274; C. Parisi Presicce 1997, 176; N. A. Winter 2009b, 191-192; contra: G. Adornato 2003, 823.

Italic art in the *late* sixth century, so they must belong to the second temple.[404] His assertion is incorrect, as heraldic felines were painted in the Tomb of the Panthers at Tarquinia, which dates to the early sixth century.[405] What is more, in his analysis, Adornato only considers comparanda for the *iconography* of the felines and only from the Italic peninsula; he does not contend with the style of the sculpture or with myriad examples of heraldic lions from elsewhere in the Mediterranean. As to the style, Adornato's late-sixth-century comparanda are primarily from tomb paintings in Tarquinia; the style of these felines, with rounded undefined musculature, smooth undefined paws and elongated bodies in a prowling posture, contrasts severely with the seated animals from S. Omobono, whose haunches are sharply outlined and paws cut with angular precision (Figs. 3.39–3.40). For a better stylistic comparison, one must look to examples from elsewhere in the Mediterranean; Mertens Horn notes that the paws of the S. Omobono felines have long, contracted toes in a style that is not seen in nature and would not be evidence of an observation of nature; rather, she suggests, it must be a stylistic trend. One finds comparanda for this execution of a paw not in Italic art of the late sixth century, but in Greek art of the late *seventh* and *early* sixth century (Fig. 3.41-3.43).[406] Two examples of lions similar in posture and style to those at S. Omobono are found on a proto-Attic amphora from Piraeus (ca. 600) and a sculpture from Perachora (ca. 580) now in the Boston Museum of Fine Arts; a similarity is also apparent in the

[404] G. Adornato 2003, 823. The assertion is false: A. Mura Sommella 1977, 87-88 and see below.
[405] G. Colonna 1991, 55.
[406] M. Mertens-Horn 1994, 273. Cf. N. A. Winter 2009b, 191-192

paws of a lion on the Chigi vase (ca. 650-600). Mertens Horn settles on a date around 580 for the S. Omobono lions, and her conclusion is in keeping with the context of the sculpture, another element of its design that Adornato overlooks: the felines are not only heraldic, they are in the pediment of a temple. Comparanda for just such an iconography and architectural context are apparent in the lion pediments of the Temple of Artemis at Corfu and perhaps on a pediment (probably relating to the Urparthenon) from the Acropolis in Athens (Figs. 3.44–3.45).[407] A date between 580 and 570 has been proposed for both. Since the stratigraphy of the site at S. Omobono precludes a date for the temple before ca. 600, the felines should date to the first quarter of the sixth century, and based on the Perachora lion and especially the comparison with Corfu, scholars tend to date the S. Omobono pediment, and therefore the first temple, between 580 and 570.[408]

Gjerstad records the discovery during the 1938 excavations of a pair coroplastic sculptures identified as Minerva and Hercules: this group helps date the second temple (Fig. 3.46).[409] The two pieces connect at Hercules' left arm and Minerva's right shoulder; the goddess is slightly behind and smaller than her partner, and her head turns slightly to

[407] For more on the comparison with these Greek temples, see below. On the temple of Artemis at Corfu: G. Rodenwaldt 1939, figs. 47-48, Pl. 42; on Athena at Syracuse: P. Orsi 1903, 622-628 and figs. 215-217, 221-223; on the temple of Athena or Urparthenon on the Acropolis: H. Payne and G. M. Young 1936, 11 and Pl. 13I and 15IV; H. Schrader*, et al.* 1939; I. Beyer 1974, 640; K. Schefold 1993, 180-184. Cf. G. Colonna 1985, 70; M. Mertens-Horn 1994, 273. In general on lions in archaic Greek art: T. Hölscher 1972; P. Müller 1978
[408] On the stratigraphy, see above "dating through stratigraphy."
[409] E. Gjerstad 1953-1973, III.452-456.

the right, toward Hercules, accentuating their connection (Fig. 3.47-3.48).[410] Both figures step forward, Hercules' hips activated with a slight torsion and Minerva's right foot in front of her left, her hair cascading down her back. The hint of movement in the statues gives them a marked if restrained animation.[411] Scholars have repeatedly tried to refine the date of the group; most agree it dates sometime between 540 and 525.[412] Mura Sommella states that the Minerva's "curved lips, which are not closed at the angles; stretched, almond-shaped eyes; accentuated chin, nose and cheekbones alongside the rounded helmet…the hair falling down her back…" betray a Greek style that dates in korai to ca. 530 (Fig. 3.49-3.50).[413] She also suggests a comparandum closer geographically to Rome in a group of bronze korai from Lavinium that were produced in South Italy.[414] One of these korai, F1, dates to the mid to late sixth century and shares several features with the statue of Minerva at S. Omobono: the nose is prominent and the artist composed the lips as two curves that only slightly touch at the corners; a ridged (though not sharp) brow connects to the bridge of the nose, and the hair of the kore is similarly drawn entirely down the figure's back, with no locks in front; one leg is slightly forward (Fig. 3.51). Mura Sommella contends that the Hercules also helps date the

[410] A. Mura Sommella 1981, 59-60. Mura Sommella subsequently reexamined the remains and discovered a point of juncture at Hercules left arm.
[411] A. Mura Sommella 1981, 60; N. A. Winter 2009b, 379-380
[412] A. Mura Sommella 1977, 122-125. Cf. G. Colonna 1985, 70; M. Cristofani 1990, 33; G. Colonna 1991, 53; Adornato is the only scholar in recent years to suggest the statue dates to the last twenty years of the sixth century. He compares the Minerva to a statue from Agrigento, but the styles of the two statues are in fact strikingly different: the face of the Agrigento sculpture is much less stylized, and on the whole, the figure far more animated: thus the later date: G. Adornato 2003, 829-830.
[413] Translation by author: A. Mura Sommella 1977, 122. Cf. G. M. A. Richter 1968, 55, figs. 327, 241-344, 354-367.
[414] A. Mura Sommella 1977, 122.

group. The paws of his lion skin, knotted around his shoulders, are splayed and rest on his chest, and the skin is cinched around his waist in a style particular to Cyprus in the mid and late sixth century. Scholars have long noted his iconographic similarities to Cypriot statues of Herakles, but they neglect several fundamental differences in the Roman figure that may help date him. While the Cypriot Herakles figures are remarkably thin and show no movement in the hips, the Roman Hercules has a full torso and a prominent raised right buttock (Fig. 3.52).[415] The form and style of his voluptuous body, his thick thighs, the torsion of his hips and the curve in the small of his back combined with a firm posture and the incorporation of the sixth century Cypriot dress all suggests that sculptors working on him were contending with a change in style most often discussed in sculpture dating from ca. 540 to 530, particularly the Anavysos kouros (Fig. 3.53). One could equally apply Richter's description of that figure to the Roman Hercules: "the forms are now more developed, more depth is given to the chest and back, the vertebral column has assumed its characteristic S-shaped curve, and the flanks bulge from the waist."[416] The movement of the legs, the tilt in the hips juxtaposed with an absence of chiasmus in the torso are present in both figures, the Anavysos kouros typically dated ca. 540-20. This is not to suggest Roman sculptors were looking to the Greek work, but simply that similar trends are alive in both works of art. The best comparanda for the S. Omobono Hercules and Athena therefore date to ca. 540-520 and suggest the Roman sculpture group belongs to the same period.

---

[415] On the Cypriot figures: E. Gjerstad*, et al.* 1934, Pl. XXII-XXIII; V. Karageorghis*, et al.* 2000, 106 ss with references; V. Karageorghis 2003.
[416] G. M. A. Richter 1949, 75.

Scholars have long contended that the group was part of a larger set of acroterial sculptures placed on the ridgepole of the temples at S. Omobono, but Mauro Cristofani and Francesco Paolo Arata argue the sculptures are too fragile and too large to be ridgepole sculpture.[417] The argument is important because its outcome determines not only the image of the temple, but also its date. If the sculpture is simply votive, it *could* belong to the first temple's occupation, being a late dedication placed somewhere around it. If on the other hand it is part of a temple's decoration it would help date that temple's construction. In an attempt to clarify how the group was used at the sanctuary, Mura Sommella conducted studies on clay used in the Hercules along with a second coroplastic group and a sphinx that scholars agree was part of the acroterial sculpture of the second temple; all three figures are of the same material and style of manufacture.[418] The consistency suggests that they were manufactured at the same time and by the same workshop. She argues that this must indicate a commission for a single project: namely, the roof sculpture of a temple. Her conclusion is confirmed by examples of similar sculpture groups from temples around Central Italy. Sculptures on the roof of a temple at Satricum are nearly identical in size, and they, along with sculptures from Veii and elsewhere, provide suitable comparanda for the use of seemingly fragile coroplastic

[417] F. P. Arata 1990, 120; M. Cristofani 1990, 33. For those who believe it was on the ridgepole: A. Mura Sommella 1977, 99-112; C. Ampolo 1981, 33; A. Mura Sommella 1981, 59-64; G. Colonna 1985, 70; G. Colonna 1991; P. S. Lulof 2000, 210; N. A. Winter 2005, 244-245.
[418] A. Mura Sommella 1993, 227.

sculptures on the ridge pole of temples.[419] Furthermore, scholars have plausibly reconstructed a large semicircular moulded terracotta as a statue base that accompanies the Hercules and Minerva, and this base is typical of plinths for ridgepole sculpture.[420] The petrography and comparanda suggest that the Roman group belongs on top of a temple. The lion pediment dates the first temple too early to include sculpture in a style like that of the Hercules and Minerva; that group must, therefore, pertain to the second temple and dates it to ca. 540-520.

The two sculpture groups provide precise dates for the two temples; it remains to consider the remaining terracottas from the temples, to clarify which temple they belong to and conclude whether or not they uphold these dates. In addition to the pedimental and ridgepole groups, archaeologists have found remains of two friezes from the small temples.

The first is extremely fragmentary: the few remnants reveal a tall revetment with a torus on top of a thin tongue band that in turn is over a frieze (Figs. 3.38, 3.54–3.55). Of the frieze, only the head and tail of felines, one facing left and the other right, remain; there is also possibly a sprig of foliage just in front of the extant feline's face.[421] Archaeologists found this frieze in the terracotta deposit above the leveling strata (phase VI); it accompanied materials that pertain to both the first and second temple.[422] Mura

[419] A. Mura Sommella 1993, 232; cf. P. S. Lulof 1993, 277-286; N. A. Winter 2009b, 379-380, 386-387
[420] Recently and with bibliography: N. A. Winter 2009b, 386-387
[421] A. Mura Sommella 1977, 68; N. A. Winter 2009b, 189-190
[422] A. Mura Sommella 1977, 71; cf. G. Colonna 1991, 54. On the stratigraphy: P. Virgili 1977, 28.

Sommella compares the line of the feline's face and the torus on top of the relief plaque to other early revetments from Poggio Buco and the Regia in Rome, concluding that it must date contemporaneously with them, to the early sixth century (Fig. 2.50). This would suggest it belongs to the first temple. Cristofani, however, has suggested that it was part of the second temple phase. He argues that the lions may have Pontic stylistic origins and if so, he argues the best local comparisons date it to ca. 540-520.[423] His argument is part of a broad attempt to suggest that all sculpture from the site belongs to the second temple. Yet Colonna has demonstrated that stylistically, the Pontic lion heads Cristofani offers as comparanda are drastically different from those on the S. Omobono reliefs.[424] Colonna regards Ionic and Ionicizing Central Italic sculptures of lions dating to the early sixth century as the closest comparisons, and the style of feline is common on early-sixth-century Corinthian ceramics, upholding their assignment to the first temple (Fig. 3.56). What is more, Mertens-Horn has convincingly argued for a date in the early sixth century for the heraldic pedimental felines, rendering Cristofani's argument that all the sculpture belongs to the second temple untenable.[425] With this in mind, and given the strength of Mura Sommella and Colonna's comparison of the frieze to early sixth century feline sculpture, these relief plaques should belong to Temple I.

The date for the second frieze type is less problematic. Archaeologists found it in the terracotta deposit as well as in other excavations throughout the leveling and fill

[423] M. Cristofani 1990, 32.
[424] G. Colonna 1991, 54-55.
[425] M. Mertens-Horn 1994, 273.

layers above.[426] The revetments have diverse upper mouldings, some with a thick torus over a short tongue band others just a strigil course. All of the remains contain a frieze showing biga and triga processing either to the left or to the right (Figs. 3.57–3.58).[427] In the scene processing to the left, a male figure holding a staff walks in front of three horses pulling a chariot; a tall man walks on the right flank of the horses and a male and female figure drive the chariot behind. At their rear, two winged horses lead another chariot, again holding a man who drives the car and stands in front of a woman. A tall male figure behind the second chariot closes the plaque. Friezes with a rightward procession show the same scene in reverse. The reliefs belong to a well-known series of revetments identified in four replicas at Rome, in two at Veii and one at Velletri.[428] At the temple in Velletri, six scenes are present, including a banquet, horse racers and a procession (Fig. 3.59). Though at one time there was confusion over the date of the type, scholars now largely agree it dates ca. 540-520.[429] Cristofani especially argues that the style and iconography of the frieze fit among Ionicizing influences in Italy that date to that period.[430] Accompanying these revetments were remains of the Laconic roof with curved cover tiles over pan tiles painted with long, delicate leaves and flowers; the curved cover tiles terminate at the edges of the roof with female heads on a lateral sima (Figs.

---

[426] A. Mura Sommella 1977, 71 for bibliography; cf. P. Virgili 1977, 28; N. A. Winter 2009b, 366-368

[427] A. Mura Sommella 1977, 71.

[428] T. N. Gantz 1974, 1-4.

[429] Nancy Winter has recently dated them precisely to ca. 530: N. A. Winter 2009b . Mura Sommella suggests they must date ca. 540-530: A. Mura Sommella 1977, 82. cf. F. Coarelli 1977, 188; G. Colonna 1985, 70; F. R. Fortunati 1986, 3-11; G. Colonna 1991, 53; on earlier arguments for a date between 525 and 510: Å. Åkerström 1954, 227; P. J. Riis 1967, 87.

[430] M. Cristofani 1977, 2.

3.60–3.61).[431] The female heads alternate with lion-head spouts interspersed with tongues. The sima is also remarkably like one used on the temple at Velletri.[432] The revetments reinforce the date of ca. 540-520 for the Hercules and Minerva, and together, they indicate that the entire preserved sculptural program for the second temple dates ca. 540-520 and that the temple itself should also date to that period.

With dates for construction established as ca. 580-570 for Temple I and ca. 540-520 for temple II, it remains to consider a few terracottas that are essential to reconstructing the image of the two small temples, though less useful for the dates. In the 1938 excavations archaeologists uncovered part of a terracotta column capital and column casings as well as four large volutes.[433] The finds are rare for Central Italy.

Gjerstad ascribes both the column capital and shaft casing to the second temple.[434] The shaft was manufactured with a light-brown clay and has a cream slip with black paint applied to it; the remaining piece is 18 cm tall (Fig. 3.62). Gjerstad found it in the destruction layer over the second temple, hence its attribution to that temple. The casing fragment does not help date the temple and has largely gone unmentioned in subsequent scholarship. On the other hand, the capital has sparked a great dialogue.[435]

---

[431] A. Mura Sommella 1977, 90-94; N. A. Winter 2009b, 344-345, 388-390
[432] A. Mura Sommella 1977, 90-94.
[433] E. Gjerstad 1953-1973, III.426-448.
[434] E. Gjerstad 1953-1973, III.426, fig. 266.423 and 448, fig. 281.422.
[435] The debate extends even to what whether the object is a capital or a base: L. S. Meritt and I. E. M. Edlund-Berry 2000, xxxiv. Edlund-Berry's suggestion that it could be a base is founded in her comparison of the S. Omobono terracotta to bases with rounds and hawksbeaks on a circular plinth. While this may be possible, there are (as I mention below)

Found in 1938, its context is unknown, so it is difficult to assign it to one temple or another (Fig. 3.63). Mura Sommella and Gjerstad both suggest it pertains to the second temple.[436] It has a squashed echinus, short abacus and a collar of leaves curving down into a deeply grooved shaft; the transition between the collar and shaft is mediated by a painted torus.[437] The leaves in the collar are painted in alternating red and black stripes that continue over the torus and down the flutes of the shaft. An immediate difference is clear between the capital and the shaft casings: the shaft is not fluted, suggesting there were two different column types on the site. While the stratigraphic context of the casing strongly suggests it belongs to the second temple, dates for the style of the capital are broad enough that it could pertain to either of the two small temples.[438] Mura Sommella draws a comparison with the Temple of Athena at Paestum (ca. 510-500) *and* the temple of Artemis at Corfu (ca. 580); similar capitals are present in the Temple of Hera I at Paestum (ca. 550-540) (Figs. 3.64–3.66).[439] In regard to form, the comparison with Corfu is the closest; as on the S. Omobono capital, the Corfu echinus curves directly up to the abacus, rather than cutting back below it: a quarter round rather than

---

as many examples of capitals with a circular abacus over a half-round echinus and a hawksbeak collar. I therefore follow the majority of scholars who contend this is a capital.

[436] A. Mura Sommella 1977, 65, 68.

[437] A. Mura Sommella 1977, 65, 68.

[438] As noted above, some terracotta fragments from the first temple were found above the second temple.

[439] D. Mertens and M. Schützenberger 2006, 146-147, esp. fig. 249. Arata and Riemer Knoop also suggest comparanda in capitals from Vulci, Portonaccio and in paintings from tombs at Tarquinia (Fig. 3.67): R. R. Knoop 1987, 59; F. P. Arata 1990, 123. While these examples do have similar profiles (a thin torus supporting a hawksbeak below a quarter-round) they do not have fluted shafts or a strigilated hawksbeak: Portonaccio: E. Stefani 1953, 46 and fig 21.u; Vulci: L. S. Meritt and I. E. M. Edlund-Berry 2000, 131; Tarquinia: S. Steingräber 2006, pl. 97, 101.

an exaggerated ovolo. The Corfu comparison is also tempting because its lion pediments is reminiscent of the one at S. Omobono. Yet the Corfu echinus (like that on the Temple of Hera I at Paestum) is much squatter and wider than on the S. Omobono capital. In regard to style, the capital from the Temple of Athena at Paestum is closest: its echinus curves much more sharply up from the collar to the abacus. The form and style of the best comparanda therefore conflict and hinder a clear ascription; in the end, while the column casing and capital do add to evidence for the reconstruction of the temples, they do not help refine their dates and cannot be definitively assigned to either.

A set of four volutes found in the 1938 excavations find their way into scholarly discourse less frequently (Fig. 3.36). Mura Sommella states that they adorned the roof of the first temple, recalling volutes seen in hut urns around Central Italy.[440] Until recently, most scholars agreed that they pertain to the first temple, but the stratigraphic context of the volutes was not reported, and so their context in Rome does not indicate the belong to one temple or the other. Nancy Winter has compared them to smaller volutes from the roofs of temples at Caprificio and Velletri, both of which date between 530 and 520.[441] She suggests the Roman volutes belong to the second temple, and were placed on the roof as frames for the ridgepole sculptures.

### *The twin temples*

[440] Her suggestion that they were on the rooftop originally came under attack, since the weight of the volutes seemed too great, but she subsequently defended her argument and most now agree with the suggestion: A. Mura Sommella 1993, 226.
[441] N. A. Winter 2009b, 383-384

A small stash of terracottas from the excavations of 1938 reinforces a date for the twin temples and their platform in the early fifth century. In all, only three revetment plaques and two roof tiles have been published. The roof tiles are undecorated and do not offer any chronological clues: Gjerstad describes one of them as a ridgepole cover and the other as part of a pedimental sima.[442] The revetments, on the other hand, offer a firm date (Fig. 3.68). The remaining fragments are part of a large anthemion relief. One piece contains a five-frond palmette held at its base by two volutes banded together; the volutes are each part of long S-shaped spirals. An undecorated band circumscribes the palmette and on this fragment the band also defines the lower edge of the plaque. Another fragment retains the other end of the S-shaped spiral where it connects with another volute. As Gjerstad points out, these fragments are identical to a set of reliefs that adorned the Acropolis temple at Ardea, and a comparison with the Ardea plaques allows a full image of the revetments at Rome (Fig. 3.69).[443] They constitute a two-tiered anthemion decoration; the top palmettes are upright and fastened at the bottom to S-shaped spirals, which curve down and lock together to hold the lower palmettes, themselves upside down. A thin band weaves between the palmettes, and a torus and strigil course top the relief. Andrén establishes a date for the Ardean plaques in the early fifth century based on the style of both the palmette and strigil as well as the delicately

[442] E. Gjerstad 1953-1973, III.448.
[443] E. Gjerstad 1953-1973, III.448.

outlined forms of the relief.[444] Similarities are clear in the elongated, animated leaves of the palmettes from other early-fifth-century anthemion reliefs at Satricum and Rome, as well as in the design of interlocking S-shaped spirals at Segni (Fig. 4.70).[445] Archaeologists do not record the context of the S. Omobono terracottas, and there can be no illusion that their stratigraphy reveals more about their association with the twin platform; yet their discovery at the site is striking. Along with the absence of fifth century finds in excavations below and within the fill of the twin-temple podium and the presence of a pavement predating the first Monteverde restoration of the site, the early-fifth-century revetments suggest that soon after the second temple's fall around 500, Romans leveled the area around S. Omobono and built an enormous cappellaccio platform. They paved the platform, probably in cappellaccio, and built two large twin temples capped with terracotta roofs sporting a novel style of double-anthemion reliefs.

## III. Imagining the temples at S. Omobono

### Temples I and II: plan

[444] A. Andrén 1940, 440 I:447, pl. 136:478 Colonna and others date the Acropolis temple in Ardea to ca. 465: G. Colonna 1984, 494.
[445] Satricum and Segni: A. Andrén 1940, pl. 122.431, 150.513; Rome: I. Nielsen and B. Poulsen 1992, pl 37.33.

Scholars agree that the scarcity of architectural remains renders any reconstruction of the temples at S. Omobono speculative.[446] Ioppolo, an architect by training, first suggested plans for temples I and II based on the remains of podia, wall socles and terracottas. He concluded that they had similar plans with a single cella flanked by alae walls that stretched to the front of the podium, and two columns in antis, in line with the side walls of the cella (Fig. 3.70).[447] Colonna adds a new interpretation of finds from the 1977 excavations to Ioppolo's reconstruction (Fig. 3.71). He suggests that the stair found in trench 1 must belong to the second temple, and several courses of stone at the top of the stair pertain to alae walls; thus, the pronaos of that temple extends further than Ioppolo originally imagined.[448] Otherwise, he supports Ioppolo's reconstruction of the two temples with alae walls on either side of the cella and pronaos; in Colonna's plan there are four columns (two rows of two columns each) in the pronaos of Temple II.[449] Scholars do not universally accept these plans, the primary concern being a lack of evidence for the cella walls and columns.

In regard to the cella walls, evidence comes from four courses of stone that Gjerstad uncovered in his excavations of the northwest corner of the building. He only mentions the wall in passing, but it is clear at the eastern (left) edge of his section (Fig.

---

[446] Il viver quotidiano in Roma arcaica: materiali degli scavi del Tempio Arcaico nell'area sacra di S. Omobono 1989, 31-35 with references.
[447] Il viver quotidiano in Roma arcaica: materiali degli scavi del Tempio Arcaico nell'area sacra di S. Omobono 1989, 31-35 and Pl. IV-V.
[448] G. Colonna 1991, 52.
[449] On the alae walls and evidence for their antae: G. Colonna 1991, 52; on Ioppolo's argument for the roof and the resulting need for internal columns: Il viver quotidiano in Roma arcaica: materiali degli scavi del Tempio Arcaico nell'area sacra di S. Omobono 1989, 34.

3.4, 3.70-A); it is parallel to the western podium wall and 1.9 meters east of it.[450] More evidence for the cella walls came to light during excavations in 1977; while uncovering the rear of the temple, workers found a clean break in the podium precisely 1.9 m from the presumed *eastern* side of the temple (Figs. 3.70-A, 3.72). In the 1977 trench, the temple's single course of foundations is present throughout the trench and continues to the east, out of it, but the podium's vertical fascia and torus as well as the wall socle are only present in the western part of the trench, terminating in a nearly perfect vertical cut.[451] The clean break at a point mirroring Gjerstad's wall is highly suggestive that the lateral cella wall fell, and it reinforces Ioppolo's reconstruction of cella walls flanked by alae. Since evidence for the cella has only been found at the rear of the temple, it remains unclear how far it extended.

Ioppolo's and Colonna's reconstructions of columns in antis in both temples presents a tougher problem. Not only is it unclear which temple the terracotta column shaft and capital casings belong to, it is also unclear if the other temple would have had columns.[452] Both Ioppolo and Colonna suggest both temples did, between the antae, Colonna adding a second row for the second temple. Ioppolo, like Colonna and Mura Sommella, believes the terracotta capital belongs to the second phase of construction; his argument for columns in the first temple, therefore, is based purely on tectonic principle.

---

[450] Sector A-B, strata 11-13: E. Gjerstad 1953-1973, III.381.
[451] G. Pisani Sartorio and P. Virgili 1979, 41, 43, fig. 42; Il viver quotidiano in Roma arcaica: materiali degli scavi del Tempio Arcaico nell'area sacra di S. Omobono 1989, Pl. II, IV.
[452] Scholars have so far not mentioned the possibility that the terracottas belong to votive columns. It would be difficult to prove such a function, but comparanda do exist in early Central Italy.

He suggests that the width between the two antae in the first temple was twelve meters and concludes that in the early sixth century, architects would not be able to span that width with wooden trabeation; thus, columns must have supported the span.[453] It is hard to reconcile his measurement: the width of the temple podium is just 10.6 meters, and the distance between the walls of the temple (.75 meters thick, each) would be just nine.[454] Nine meters is not a short distance and would be too wide for a post and lintel roof, but evidence from Central Italy and western Greek sites indicates that architects were spanning much wider gaps covered with much heavier roofs in the same period.[455] Columns were therefore not strictly necessary, and since archaeologists have not found evidence for foundations supporting columns in the front area of the temples, their inclusion in plans should remain tentative. Given that the column capital and shaft casings are not assignable with certainty to either phase, the arrangement of columns in the pronaos of both temples remains hypothetical (Fig. 3.73).

Other aspects of the temples' plans are clearer; scholars generally agree on the position and design of the staircases and altar as well as the location of alae walls flanking the cella. Ioppolo's excavations uncovered the full width of the stairway to the first temple as 2.5 m; based on a calculation of the height of each step in correspondence with

[453] Il viver quotidiano in Roma arcaica: materiali degli scavi del Tempio Arcaico nell'area sacra di S. Omobono 1989, 34.
[454] G. Pisani Sartorio and P. Virgili 1979, 43.
[455] For example: T. Hodge 1960, 17-42; J. M. Turfa and A. G. Steinmayer, Jr. 1996, 22, n. 34 with references; N. L. Klein 1998, 351. Also, see chapter 5: "roofing the Capitoline Temple."

the overall height of the podium, he concludes that there were seven steps creating a staircase approximately 1.65 meters tall and 1.65 meters deep.[456] The altar for the sanctuary is two meters south of the stair and on axis with it. Colonna identifies the stair at the front of the second temple in three courses that are parallel to the front of the temple.[457] In Temple II, the staircase intersects the altar at the axial center of the temple, closing the middle portion of the stair and forcing one's approach to either side of the altar. The alae walls constitute the outside walls of the building and are preserved for both temples in remains from several excavations.[458] In the first temple, they are preserved along the west side and rear of the temple; in the second they are present along the west side and atop the staircase at the southeast corner. The wall atop the stair to the second temple indicates that the perimeter, alae walls extended to the front of that podium, terminating in antae at the sides of the staircase. For the first temple, there is no evidence that the side walls stretched to the front of the podium, but since the two temples' cellas seem to match, and because stretches of both temples' wall socles are preserved along the west side of the podium, scholars believe the first temple's alae walls would correspond to the second temple's, also terminating in antae at the front of the podium.

**Temples I and II: elevation**

[456] A. M. Colini 1959-1960, 6.
[457] G. Colonna 1991, 53.
[458] See above, phases II and III.

The elevation of the temples from the base of the walls to the bottom of the roof is unknown. One can only surmise the height of the columns based on Vitruvian analysis, a thorny practice.[459] Scholars tend to accept this limitation and do not apply Vitruvius' proportions to the temple; they find other ways to suggest an elevation. Ioppolo states that a slight inward list in the bottom of the second temple's wall socle suggests that they leaned inward for their full height, but this is speculative and lacks comparative evidence. Ioppolo is also cavalier about reconstructing the height of the temples' walls. He argues that the volume of clay found in excavations behind the temple provides an estimate for the total amount of clay used in the walls, and therefore an indication of their height.[460] But since archaeologists have not uncovered the entire area around the temples, it is unclear how far the clay deposit spread and whether it was of a uniform thickness; without further excavation a true calculation of the amount of clay used in the walls is impossible to gauge. Thus the design and height of the temple walls is presently unclear. A few fundamental aspects of the elevation are, however, evident: given the mass of muddy clay and the roof terracottas, one can assume that above the stone socle, the walls were built in mud brick and that the trabeation for the roof was in wood.

[459] Il viver quotidiano in Roma arcaica: materiali degli scavi del Tempio Arcaico nell'area sacra di S. Omobono 1989, 32.
[460] Il viver quotidiano in Roma arcaica: materiali degli scavi del Tempio Arcaico nell'area sacra di S. Omobono 1989, 33.

Each temple sported extensive terracotta decoration affixed to the wooden roof. The full program of the first temple is unknown, but some important aspects of its design remain.[461] Along the raking geisa architects placed revetments with lions either processing or flanking a vegetal motif beneath a band of tongues, itself supporting a painted torus (Figs 3.38, 3.54-3.55). Both remaining pieces of this frieze preserve a finished edge on an angle, indicating they belonged at the lower corners of the roof.[462] The angle of their cut allows an initial hypothesis that the roof had a pitch of twenty-one degrees.[463] Similar revetments may also have adorned the lateral geisa or simae. In the triangular space between the raking geisa and frontal horizontal geison, architects affixed the large heraldic terracotta felines and painted flat terracotta plaques to a closed wooden pediment. Nail holes in the feline sculptures of the pediment and in the corner revetments do not conform to a horizontal or vertical grid, which suggests a solid wooden backing (Figs. 3.35, 3.37). The angle of the corner pieces confirms the slope of the roof is twenty-one degrees. Archaeologists record that painted figures (now lost) once adorned the unsculpted flat panels of the pediment.[464] At the middle of the gable archaeologists reconstruct the felines; their heads and the angle of their posture (from haunches to head) indicates they occupied most of the middle of the pediment, but they are not tall enough to reach the apex of the gable. Instead, scholars believe a running

[461] for a full reconstruction: N. A. Winter 2009b, 149-150.
[462] A. Mura Sommella 1977, 68-71.
[463] I think Nancy Winter for confirming the correct roof angles in this chapter. Cf. N. A. Winter 2009b, 149-150.
[464] A. Mura Sommella 1977, 86.

gorgon occupied the center, flanked by the felines.[465] The suggestion finds support in a small group of terracottas that are of the same fabric as the felines and backing, but do not match the felines' iconography (Fig. 3.74). After comparing these fragments to other figures, Mertens-Horn concludes that they resemble wings and a belt from other images of running gorgons, especially one from the pediment of a temple to Athena at Syracuse. Based on the size of the fragment, and in comparison with other examples, she reconstructs the gorgon as 1.5-1.6 m tall, a perfect height for the central pedimental sculpture of the temple at S. Omobono since it fits within the slope of the roof and would be slightly taller than the 1.4 m felines (Fig. 3.75).[466] To complete the terracotta decoration of the temple, Mura Sommella and others suggests that architects must have placed the four large volutes either along the raking simae or along the rooftop on either side of the ridge pole.

The terracotta decoration of the second temple is also fragmentary, but again, partial remains suggest its overall character. As with the first temple, the raking geison revetments (here showing a procession of people, horses and chariots) preserve a slanted edge revealing the angle of the roof's slope as eighteen degrees (Fig. 3.57).[467] The rooftop was covered in terracotta tiles following a Laconic system with curved cover tiles and painted pan tiles, and along the lateral edges of the roof, the sima with female heads and lion head spouts closed the edge of the temple. Another decorated sima plaque has

[465] M. Mertens-Horn 1994, 272; A. Mura Sommella 1977, 83-89; G. Colonna 1988b, 313; F. P. Arata 1990, 123; A. Mura Sommella 2000a, 13-14.
[466] M. Mertens-Horn 1994, 272; cf. A. Mura Sommella 2000a, 13-14.
[467] A. Mura Sommella 1977, 78; N. A. Winter 2009b, 316-318.

also been identified in excavations at S. Omobono. This revetment is stamped with a relief of meanders alternating in swastikas and rectangles (Fig. 3.76). It is a copy from a series also found at Velletri in connection with the procession frieze; there the meander and superimposed strigilated sima are part of the procession revetments and the rectangles in the meander are empty.[468] At Rome the plaque is isolated, not part of the procession revetments, and stars and swans are stamped inside the rectangles. Scholars are unable to place this sima plaque with certainty; Mura Sommella suggests it may go on the lateral sima but also assigns the (sima) revetment with lion spouts to the sides, presenting a problem for the reconstruction.[469] The meander revetments may instead belong on the frontal and rear horizontal simae. At the corners of the roof, statues of sphinxes served as acroteria; they closely resemble acroteria from the temple at Velletri. Cristofani argues the acroteria from the two temples are identical and reconstructs a neck and head for the S. Omobono acroteria by joining the head and neck of the Velletrian sphinx to the Roman body (Fig. 3.77).[470]

The Hercules and Minerva figures appeared on the ridgepole, though precisely where is uncertain; at least one other fragmentary sculpture stood on the ridge as well and may have depicted Dionysus and Ariadne/Leukothea, though this remains unclear (Fig. 3.78).[471] Scholars routinely uphold the identity of the first group as Hercules and Minerva: Hercules' identification is considered unquestionable, given the cinched lion's

[468] A. Mura Sommella 1977, 78; cf. E. Gjerstad 1953-1973, III.454.
[469] A. Mura Sommella 1977, 78, 90-94.
[470] M. Cristofani 1990, 36-37; M. Cristofani 1990, 135-137.
[471] See below

skin; and scholars see the female figure as Minerva both because of her helmet, suggestive of military garb, and because of her association with Hercules in the group.[472] Coarelli suggests, however, that the female figure may not necessarily be Minerva, stating that "there is no trace of a gorgon," and without it, the identification is uncertain.[473] Instead he argues the figure may be a Venus-Astarte goddess present at Pyrgi and elsewhere. Yet in an extensive study of late-sixth- and early-fifth-century sculpture groups of Minerva and Hercules, Patricia Lulof identifies several groups exhibiting the same iconography as the S. Omobono statues that unquestionably represent Hercules apotheosized with Minerva, and scholars have since largely agreed on the identification of the Roman group.[474] An identification for the second sculpture group on the ridgepole is less clear. It is extremely fragmentary, with only the upper back of a female figure and the left hand of a much smaller figure resting on her left shoulder (Fig. 3.79).[475] Scholars first suggested the group was Eos and Kephalos, citing as a comparandum the famous pair from Caere.[476] Mertens-Horn argues, however, that this is not possible, nor can the female figure be Eos' Etruscan equivalent, Thesan; both of their iconographies include wings, and the garment of the figure at S. Omobono does

[472] For example: E. Gjerstad 1953-1973, III.448; A. Mura Sommella 1977, 84-88; C. Ampolo 1981, 32-35; M. Cristofani 1981, 31; A. Mura Sommella 1981, 59-60; F. P. Arata 1990, 120; M. Cristofani 1990, 136; M. Cristofani 1990, 33; A. Mura Sommella 1990, 116.
[473] F. Coarelli 1981, esp. 36; F. Coarelli 1988b, 144.
[474] P. S. Lulof 2000, 207-219.
[475] A. Mura Sommella 1977, 107.
[476] A. Mura Sommella 1977, 113. Cf. A. Andrén 1940, pl. 11; also, M. Cristofani 1990, 136. N. A. Winter 2009b, 381-382

not allow for them.[477] Instead, she suggests the group must be Ino-Leukothea, indicating a tie to the Isthmian games and Tarquinius Priscus' incorporation of them into Roman life.[478] In contrast, Parisi Presicce suggests that small globular terracottas found at S. Omobono may be grapes that were somehow incorporated into the temple's decoration: thus, he suggests the group is Hermes holding the infant Dionysus.[479] Recently, though, Anna Mura Sommella, Nancy Winter and Patricia Lulof have presented a combined argument for a new interpretation.[480] Winter argues that a hind paw on a torus acroterial base belongs to the temple; Mura Sommella suggests other pieces pertained to the same base, including a braded revetment, which she considers to be a staff. Together they conclude the group is a standing male and female, the male with his arm around the female's shoulder. Mura Sommella adds that the group represents Dionysus and Ariadne/Leukothea. While this is possible, the association of all the finds with one statue group requires that the temple had just two ridgepole sculptures. Otherwise, the fragments could belong to two (or more) distinct works and could be reconstructed differently. Given that Central Italic ridgepole sculpture is usually found in more than pairs (e.g. at Veii, Satricum and Murlo) it seems unlikely that there are just two on the S. Omobono temple. The suggestion is entirely possible, but a cautious reading of the fragments leaves the identification open.

---

[477] M. Mertens-Horn 1997, 145.
[478] M. Mertens-Horn 1997, 145-147.
[479] C. Parisi Presicce 1997, 173.
[480] I thank Nancy Winter for describing the content of these talks. The idea was presented in three as yet unpublished papers from the conference proceedings, Deliciae Fictiles IV.

### Temples I and II: the site around the building

A reconstruction of the sanctuary is not complete without an analysis of the finds and geography surrounding the buildings: both of the early sanctuaries were host to a rich votive deposit that surrounded temples in a low-lying area. Archaeologists note that votives for the second temple were scattered all around it, atop a pavement; one can imagine the same was true of the first temple. Throughout the use of each temple, visitors to the site left offerings at the base of the podia, cluttering the area with precious objects. The area around the base of the first temple is 7.1 masl, well below the Tiber's flood level, but architects raised the structure on a two-meter-tall podium; the second temple's podium, set on a slightly elevated pavement, rose to the same elevation as the first. That is to say, the floor of both temples is 9.1 masl. This is the same elevation as the Forum, which was filled just a quarter century before the first temple at S. Omobono; the similar elevation suggests that from the late seventh century, architects in Rome attended to the problem of annual flooding, and at S. Omobono, kept the temples out of reach of frequent disastrous inundation.

### The Twin Temples

With the next phase of construction at the site, Romans circumvented any major concerns about flooding; the new twin temple platform was approximately 12.75 masl.[481] In contrast to the first and second temples, which are oriented north-northeast to south-southwest, the twin temples are oriented directly north-south; their platform creates a shelf off the southwest corner of the Capitoline hill, its rear and eastern side only a few courses deep, but its front projecting five meters above the natural ground level. On all sides and especially at the front, the temples and their platform loomed high above the surrounding area. Even in the Empire, the Vicus Iugarius was lower than the rear of the temple platform, and remains of an Imperial spur of the street flanking the north side of the sanctuary descends from a meter below the platform at the rear to nearly two meters below it at the front (Fig. 3.80). A similar situation exists around the Temple of Apollo Medicus in the Campus Martius just a few hundred meters from the S. Omobono platform. There, either in the late fifth or early fourth century, architects raised a platform nearly five meters off the ground, and situated a temple at its rear.[482] The fourth century Temple of Portunus exhibits a similar dramatically high podium, though this temple lacks the large platform and open space in front. Thus, it seems that architects building in the low-lying areas around the worrisome Tiber had decided to take more serious precaution when building monumental architecture, the platform at S. Omobono being an early example of their efforts to overcome the problem.

---

[481] Measure calculated from the top of the torus of the first temple to the top of Gjerstad's stratum 3, the first pavement foundation; this is confirmed by a measure from SARA NISTRI, S.l.r., a cartographic group in Rome.
[482] P. Ciancio Rossetto 1998, 192-195.

As with the small temples, any reconstruction of the archaic twin temples is speculative, but a conspicuous correspondence between the archaic cappellaccio foundations and the late-Republican and Imperial superstructures remaining on the site allows a tentative suggestion of the plan (Figs. 3.1–3.2, 3.27, 3.81–3.82).[483] The Imperial remains correspond to two temples at the north end of the platform with their backs to the Capitoline; they flank a central, longitudinal passageway that leads from the Vicus Iugarius to a platform at the front of the temples. The rear wall of the platform supports the rear walls of the two temples; the west ala colonnade of the west temple and the east ala colonnade of the east temple are on top of the longitudinal perimeter walls of the platform, and the opposing alae colonnades of each temple are on two longitudinal foundations that flank the central passageway The cellas rest on deep cappellaccio walls and in front of the cellas' side walls, four foundation pillars support four columns in antis. In front of the temple buildings, a large, solid cappellaccio platform created an open space slightly lower than the temples themselves. A stair of some kind, whether across the whole width of the temples or only between the center columns, mediated the change in elevation. Scholars contend that the imperial superstructure would correspond precisely with that of the original twin temples; this seems clear for the cellas and columns in front of them, but the character of the alae is debatable. It is possible that they were originally solid walls instead of colonnades. In all, the platform measures 47.5

[483] The reconstruction is based on a premise outlined in chapter 3: in the archaic period architects tend only to build foundations under colonnades, walls and thresholds in the superstructure.

meters square, and each temple is 20.5 m wide and 29.5 m long.[484] The central intercolumniation is 6.5 m, as measured between the internal faces of the cella walls and columns. Though only fragments remain, a wooden roof sheathed in terracotta tiles and revetments would have capped each temple. Comparison with the extant plaques from Ardea reveals that the S. Omobono double anthemion frieze plaques were 70 cm tall, one of the largest examples of the double anthemion dating to the early fifth century.

## IV. Contextualizing the temples: artistic and topographic concerns

### Style, iconography and form in the architecture and sculpture

#### *Plans and podia*

Though only the fundamental elements of their plans are clear, traces of the temples at S. Omobono reveal how each building fits into the broader world of archaic Mediterranean construction and design.

The first two temples were characterized by high podia and frontal staircases; they were closed on three sides and one could only enter them by frontal approach. Once inside the temples, alae walls restricted one's perspective of the world around to a view of the south. In both buildings long colonnades are absent; instead a few columns

[484] G. Pisani Sartorio 1990, 114.

in antis may have defined their façades. As scholars have long repeated, each of these traits is quintessentially Central Italic.[485]

The S. Omobono buildings recall small, single-room religious structures typically called "oikos" temples; these were common throughout the Mediterranean in the seventh century; but starting in the sixth century, their fundamental features—frontality, side and rear walls, a lack of lateral and rear colonnades—fade from major religious architecture outside of Central Italy. In the Greek world a radical shift in temple design beginning at the turn of the century led to a change in scale, materials, and especially plan. By then, architects at Corfu, Olympia, Thermon, Isthmia and elsewhere were replacing frontal buildings, walled on three sides, with temples circumscribed by colonnades and large stone steps. The new design allowed access to the peristyles from any point and fundamentally altered both the image of the temple and one's interaction with it. In Central Italy too there was a change in architecture at the start of the sixth century, but the shift was chiefly in size and building material. Even as architects began building bigger temples out of new materials like stone and terracotta, they maintained the frontality of earlier oikos temples, often with a single room fronted by columns. Over time, "oikos" temples would largely (though certainly no entirely) disappear from the Greek architectural landscape, but in Central Italy, as architects monumentalized their religious buildings, the primary features of oikos temples would prevail.[486]

---

[485] Most recently: I. E. M. Edlund-Berry 2008, 441.

[486] Exceptions are mostly found in southern Italy, where it is possible architects were working under similar influences to those in central Italy.

The first temple at S. Omobono is the earliest known oikos temple in Central Italy to experience the monumentalization of these features. Its plan is similar to earlier temples at Veii and Gabii, where a single-room temple supported a wood, thatch or terracotta roof, but at S. Omobono, architects reinvented this plan by raising the single room high on a stone podium and flanking it with walled-in spaces, alae. The position of the building, raised off the ground, demanded a tall staircase at the front and further accentuated one's inability to access the temple from the sides and rear. One might characterize the design as an innovation in familiar architectural forms. For anyone from Rome or Central Italy, it would have been recognizable for its austerity, the walled exterior, frontal access and single room, but new for its podium, moulding and prominent staircase. As the sculpture suggests, though, this building was probably not seen (or designed) exclusively by Central Italic people, and as I discuss in detail below, the riverside sanctuary would have been the threshold for foreigners coming to Rome and Central Italy; its image would therefore give one of the first impressions of Central Italic culture to foreigners coming to the region. Although oikos temples still stood throughout the Mediterranean, the design of the Roman building would have seemed a strange choice to foreigners, especially Greek. To them, monumentalization was meant to accompany peripteral design; at Rome, it was instead attended by a podium and the maintenance of frontality. Also, Romans were using mouldings in a way that would become standard for them, but would be alien to people from elsewhere in the Mediterranean. Whereas Greeks mostly used them for column bases and for the upper reaches of their temples, at S. Omobono, architects employed the torus moulding as part

of the podium, mediating vertical and horizontal elements in the *base* of the temple.[487] This idiosyncratic use of mouldings would have seemed out of place to non-Central-Italic eyes, and together with the podium and stair, it marks a shift in Central Italic temples.[488] It seems, in fact, that Roman architects used monumentality not *in spite* of frontality, but rather in an attempt to further emphasize it. Scholars have long suggested that raised podia and frontal dispositions were indispensable for the performance of Central Italic (especially Etruscan) religious rites, including augury.[489] The first temple at S. Omobono shows evidence of an early combination of architectural trends in monumental form for that purpose. Given the fragmentary remains of Central Italic architecture, it is difficult to say that Temple I at S. Omobono is the first to exhibit a high podium, round moulding and prominent staircase; still the absence of any precursor in the archaeological record suggests that it is at least *among* the first.[490] As such, it would surely seem innovative to neighboring cultures, but familiar; to Rome's visitors from more distant lands, its design would have seemed thoroughly indigenous.

---

[487] An exception to this in the Greek world is the Siphnian Treasury at Delphi. This and a few other buildings like it belong to Ionic and Cycladic culture and may be evidence of Ionian influence on the temple at S. Omobono. Such influence would not be out of place, as the sculptures of the first and second temple suggest eastern influence. For more on their style, see below.

[488] On the use of the podium moulding as foreign to Greeks: I. E. M. Edlund-Berry 2008, 143. Another subtle difference in the temple at S. Omobono is the use of a half-round, slightly though clearly different from the Greek ovolo, whose curve is slightly higher than vertical center.

[489] Recently: G. Colonna 2006; N. L. C. Stevens 2009.

[490] Every known earlier temple in Central Italy is founded on the ground, i.e. without a podium, and Shoe-Meritt and Edlund-Berry argue that the initial function of the moulding was to mediate the verticality of the podium and the horizontality of the temple floor. It therefore seems unlikely that mouldings would have been used on early oikos temples. See I. E. M. Edlund-Berry 2008, 141 with references.

The second temple largely follows the same plan, and as temples throughout the Mediterranean—some even in Central Italy—were quickly incorporating peripteral designs at the end of the sixth century, Temple II at S. Omobono reinforced the site's traditional character and adherence to Central Italic religious requirements.[491] It maintains the high podium, closed sides and strict frontal access by means of a prominent (larger) staircase. Its chief innovation lies in the novel double round mouldings along the podium. As Edlund-Berry argues, it would become a staple in Central Italic architecture throughout the fifth and fourth centuries, down to the late Roman Republic.[492] Again, it is impossible to say if the S. Omobono temple is the earliest temple to use the moulding, but if it was not, builders there quickly isolated and incorporated the new style into their sanctuary, demonstrating Rome's awareness of (if not participation in the establishment of) new architectural styles.

In the twin temples architects moved away from the common Central-Italic architectural practice of isolating single temples on high podia and instead created an enormous platform off the slope of the Capitoline Hill supporting twin temples. Few contemporaneous models for the platform exist in Central Italy, or even the Mediterranean. Scholars compare the platform to sanctuaries at Cos and elsewhere, but these much later Hellenistic sites are strikingly different.[493] In the Hellenistic sanctuaries

[491] The first temple at Satricum has colonnades on three sides, suggesting an early interest in Campanian-Greek style: J. A. K. E. De Waele 1981, 31-34.
[492] I. E. M. Edlund-Berry 2008, 142-144.
[493] For the comparison, e.g. F. Coarelli 1988a, 33.

architects surrounded temples with large open spaces and peristyles on three or four sides. At Rome the temples occupy the entire width of the platform; the only open area is their forecourt, and there is no evidence of an enclosure wall or surrounding colonnade. Both geographically and in regard to form, the closest comparison for the twin temples at Rome is the early Ara della Regina at Tarquinia (Fig. 3.83). By the late sixth century, almost fifty years prior to the twin temples at Rome, architects there had built a monumental temple on a platform off the northern slope of the Pian della Regina. As in Rome, the temple is perched off the side of a hill, with shallow substructures on the uphill side and tall foundation walls on the south, downhill, side, allowing the temple to hover over the lowland. Not only does the temple at Tarquinia sit on a platform, but the plan of the platform, foundations and temple are strikingly similar to the Roman temples. As at Rome, at Tarquinia longitudinal and transverse walls support a long cella and alae, and pillars under the pronaos support four frontal columns; at the front of the temple, an uninterrupted mass of stone, like the platform under the forecourt at Rome, creates an artificial open space off the edge of the hill at Tarquinia.[494] The similarities between the temple at Tarquinia and those in Rome suggest close contact between the cities and perhaps the presence of Tarquinian architects at Rome. The concept of the *twin* temples on the platform is, however, unique to S. Omobono in this period.

Overall, the plans of all archaic temples at S. Omobono, their podia and the platform of the twin temples—the essentials of the structures—are of manifestly Central

[494] M. Bonghi Jovino 1997, 87-89.

Italic design. Not only do nearby comparanda leap to the forefront of any comparative analysis, but comparanda in the Greek world and elsewhere in the Mediterranean are elusive. The apparent indigenous roots of the buildings serve as a vital backdrop against which to view the temples' extant decorative program.

### *The sculpture*

In the first temple at S. Omobono architects combined a familiar local if innovative plan with markedly foreign sculptural decoration. It is hard to overestimate the significance of the pediment. The form alone is conspicuously inconsistent with Central Italic temples: no surviving sanctuary in Latium or Etruria bears evidence of a closed pediment until the third century, over three hundred years after Temple I at S. Omobono.[495] In the absence of architectural remains, scholars have looked to votive temple models to find comparanda for the Roman roof.[496] Extensive study of the models and the correlation of their forms to contemporaneous temple architecture has revealed some striking parallels, but still, the closed pediment is largely absent.[497] Staccioli records just two models from the sixth or fifth centuries that may have closed pediments: one from Velletri, another from Veii (Fig. 3.84).[498] Yet the model from

[495] The best known examples of closed pediments are from Falerii, Pyrgi and Talamone date to the late third or second centuries.
[496] A. Mura Sommella 1977, 84. Scholars do not agree that these models should be used to identify architectural forms.
[497] R. A. Staccioli 1968; c.f. N. A. Winter 2006b
[498] R. A. Staccioli 1968, 91-92; cf. A. Mura Sommella 1977, 84.

Velletri does not show any evidence of a lintel to distinguish a true pediment.[499] Rather at either of the short ends it shows a solid wall from the ground to the peak of the roof; at the front, this wall is pierced by the doorway. In fourth and third century models representing buildings with true closed pediments there is invariably a lintel above the door and across the rear of the temple to indicate a division between wall and gable (Fig. 3.85).[500] The only sixth century model with what might constitute a lintel and thus a true closed pediment is the Veii votive, but scholars tend to date it to the middle of the sixth century, after the first temple at S. Omobono.[501]

With its closed pediment, Temple I stands in stark contrast to other Central Italic temples; the sculpture that filled the gable is equally unusual for Central Italy. As Adornato is quick to suggest, the iconography of felines flanking a Gorgon in a pediment is notably absent in both architectural and non-architectural sculpture throughout Central Italy in the early sixth century.[502] Yet as Mertens-Horn, Colonna, Mura Sommella and others have demonstrated, stylistically, the pedimental sculpture dates no later than ca. 570; the same is true of felines on revetments from the temple's raking geisa.[503] The only examples of heraldic felines in Central Italy dating to the early sixth century are those in tomb paintings at Tarquinia, notably the Tomb of the Panthers.[504]

---

[499] R. A. Staccioli 1968, 91-92.
[500] These models date from the fourth to first centuries BCE: R. A. Staccioli 1968.
[501] R. A. Staccioli 1981, 38-41.
[502] G. Adornato 2003, 823-824.
[503] A. Mura Sommella 1977, 86; M. Cristofani 1990, 32; G. Colonna 1991, 54-55; M. Mertens-Horn 1994, 272-274; A. Mura Sommella 2000a, 13-14; on the geison decoration, recently: N. A. Winter 2006c, 354.
[504] G. Colonna 1991, 55.

Yet in the early Tarquinian tombs, the felines are standing or striding and have one or both paws on the base or sides of a column or plinth. At Rome, the lions' haunches are firmly on the ground, their rear legs folded in a seated or crouched position; the curve of the upper body indicates they do not climb anything, and the paws show no evidence that they were attached to anything, such as a column or altar base. What is more, Mertens-Horn's arguments for a central Gorgon have gained acceptance; the reconstruction only further undermines attempts to liken the sculpture to Central Italic comparanda, where gorgons do not feature between heraldic lions.[505] Faced with the distinct style and form of the lions and the proposed central Gorgon, scholars return repeatedly to the only known comparandum that combines all aspects of the S. Omobono pediment: the Temple of Artemis at Corfu.[506] Here, lions with similarly styled feet crouch in the temple's pediment, flanking a running Gorgon. Other temples at Syracuse (Temple of Athena) and Athens (Ur Parthenon pediment) exhibit similar sculpture and the comparanda have drawn a string of arguments about Rome's connection to distant cities.[507] Mertens-Horn emphasizes that Corfu and Syracuse were both havens for Bacchiads who fled the Cypselid tyranny in late-seventh-century Corinth.[508] She draws a connection to Tarquinius Priscus, purported son of a Bacchiad, Demaratus, and a possible patron of the S. Omobono temple; she concludes that the Bacchiads built temples at all three sites (Corfu, Syracuse and Rome) as thanks offerings

[505] A. Mura Sommella 2000a, 13-14.
[506] A. Mura Sommella 1977, 86; M. Cristofani 1990, 32; G. Colonna 1991, 54-55; M. Mertens-Horn 1994, 272-274; A. Mura Sommella 2000a, 13-14.
[507] On Syracuse: P. Orsi 1903. On Athens, see now K. Schefold 1993, 180-184
[508] M. Mertens-Horn 1994, 270.

after the overthrow of the Cypselids around 580.[509] The argument is tempting, but speculative; scholars repeatedly question both the chronology and historicity of the Bacchiads and Demaratus, and many doubt the historical accuracy of the literary tradition of early Rome. Nevertheless, Mertens-Horn's basic argument is hard to dispute: the composition and iconography of the 580 temple pediment at S. Omobono is unique to Central Italy and its only comparanda lie in these Greek temples.[510] What is more, in contrast to Central Italy, where the closed pediment itself is anomalous, Greek architects working in the early sixth century routinely employed a closed pediment to address the space between architrave and raking geisa in their temples.

The comparison suggests that architects in Rome were harnessing trends from outside of the region when building the first temple at S. Omobono. It remains unclear what precisely that influence was. At present there are insufficient local comparanda to determine if craftsmen were working in a Roman or even Central Italic artistic style, which might indicate local designers; also, the manufacturing technique is similar to other coroplastic groups found throughout Italy and Sicily. What is more, in the early sixth century, terracotta was a common material for architectural sculpture throughout the Mediterranean. Thus it is unclear whether the roof was the product of foreign architects and sculptors working in Rome or local Roman architects and sculptors choosing foreign trends. Though the source of the foreign inspiration is vexing, one thing *is* clear: the

[509] On the Corinthian link and problems with De maratus: F. Zevi 1995.
[510] For further discussion of the pervasiveness not just of running gorgons flanked by lions, but the particular affinity for gorgons and lions together in temple pediments throughout the Greek world: C. Marconi 2007, 214-218

iconography of the S. Omobono pediment is alien to contemporaneous Central Italy and strikingly similar to temples at Syracuse and Corfu, indicating a direct influence on the Roman temple from abroad. It is hard to imagine sculptors creating such similar pedimental programs with no knowledge of the parallels in other cities, and it is doubtful that builders would choose expensive and prominent decoration for a religious building on a whim; the sculpture was, in one scholar's words, "meant to be seen."[511] In this sense, with a conspicuous foreign motif, the temple broke step with the corpus of architecture in the surrounding region, and through the choice of an uncharacteristic closed pediment with exotic decoration, the temple's architects employed an artistic vocabulary from outside Etruria and Latium; they looked instead to trends popular and current in distant polities. Architects incorporated the pediment into the first temple at S. Omobono at the same time as builders in the Forum were using Campanian style gorgon antefixes in the Regia and perhaps in a building at the Comitium; throughout the city, Romans were participating for the first time in a wider Mediterranean world of art and culture that would persist in the next phase of construction.

For the second temple, architects combined local and foreign sculptural styles and iconographies in revetments and acroterial sculpture, once again adopting trends popular throughout the Mediterranean and new to Central Italy. The corner sphinx acroteria and revetments with scenes of procession have well known comparanda at Veii, Velletri and elsewhere in Rome. In each city and each building, the date of the

[511] P. S. Lulof 2000, 213.

procession frieze is tied to its style, so at present it is impossible to know what building it appeared on first.[512] The dates of the Minerva and Hercules at Rome, do, however pull the date of the Roman temple to the highest allowable dates for the frieze's style, ca. 540-525, and so if it was not the first to employ the revetments it would have done so within a decade of its predecessor(s).[513] The use of procession iconography on frieze plaques is not new to Central Italy; in revetments dating to the early sixth century, artists designed processions of chariots in revetments along the geisa and simae of buildings at Acquarossa and Murlo.[514] The forms are well known and pervade the art of the Mediterranean in the late seventh to early sixth century from Ionia to South Italy and Etruria.[515] Yet long before the mid to late sixth century, sculptors on the Greek mainland and in the Greek west had been adorning their temples with Doric triglyphs and metopes or unsculpted entablatures, and they painted and sculpted geometric and floral patters on raking simae and geisa.[516] The procession and chariot racing, hunting and banqueting that once existed on temples at places like Metaponto were now largely absent. In Ionia and Central Italy, on the other hand, figural relief sculpture remained

---

[512] Petrographic analysis of the Roman tiles so far does not help suggest a home for the moulds or the clay. It does seem that craftsmen used a different clay in Veii than they did at Rome and Velletri (where the fabric is much closer), leading some scholars to suggest two different workshops. A. J. Ammerman*, et al.* 2008; N. A. Winter*, et al.* 2009.

[513] The frieze has been dated between ca. 540 and 500, but scholars believe the Hercules and Athena must date between 540 and 530. See above, "dating the remains." Winter dates the frieze precisely to 530, but I prefer to leave its chronology open.

[514] Cf. N. A. Winter 2005, 242-244; on Acquarossa: C. Wikander 1981; On Murlo: R. D. De Puma and J. P. Small 1994.

[515] On Ionia, e.g. Å. Åkerström 1966; on S. Italy and Sicily, e.g. D. Mertens and M. Schützenberger 2006, 90-95; on Central Italy: N. A. Winter 2009b.

[516] D. Mertens and M. Schützenberger 2006, 104-256.

popular through the third quarter of the sixth century.[517] As Cristofani and Åkerström suggest, the S. Omobono revetments (and others from the Veii–Rome–Velletri group) fit neatly into a resurgence in Central Italic art of elongated delicate styles common in late-sixth-century Ionian relief sculpture (Fig. 3.59, 3.86-3.87).[518] At S. Omobono little of the relief remains and at present it is impossible to gauge its full significance. It is clear, however, that in choosing this relief and in accompanying it with acroterial sphinxes that are part of a popular iconography and style of sculpture, Romans were looking to Central Italic trends in a large portion of the temple's decorative program.

Hercules' image and cult were also long-since popular in Italy when Romans erected a sculpture to the demigod on the roof of Temple II; yet near-life-size sculptures of Hercules are not common in Central Italy in the sixth century, and although the pair were certainly seen in imported Corinthian and Attic pottery, Hercules' association with Minerva is not well documented in art created in the region.[519] In the absence of comparanda pre-dating the sculpture group at Rome, scholars highlight its foreign style, with Hercules' cinched Cypriot lion skin and Minerva's Ionic helmet, and brand the two as an allegorical symbol that links Rome to Athens and the East.[520] The comparison with eastern styles and prominent iconographical choices at Athens has prompted fervent debate.

---

[517] Å. Åkerström 1966; N. A. Winter 2009b, 311-504; cf. M. Cristofani 1977, 2.
[518] Å. Åkerström 1954, esp. 196-206; M. Cristofani 1977, 2.
[519] On early representations of Hercules: M. S. Olofsson 2006, 122-129 with references.
[520] On the Cypriot Herakles and Ionic Minerva, e.g. E. Gjerstad 1953-1973, III.454-456; M. Cristofani 1977, 2-7; A. Mura Sommella 1977, 122-128; P. S. Lulof 2000, 209. On a link between Athens and Rome: C. Ampolo 1981; contra: C. Bruun 1993.

Among the first eastern comparisons scholars make is Hercules' Cypriot dress.[521] What is striking about the connection is the absence of similar influences elsewhere in the Mediterranean; though Cyprus was a haven for traders who crisscrossed the sea in the late sixth century, few of these sculptures of Herakles with a belted lion skin appear in contexts off the island.[522] Nancy Winter has recently suggested that the style is not Cypriot, but Athenian. She states that the earliest examples of Cypriot Herakles with tunics beneath the lion skin date ca. 500, after the S. Omobono group, but in fact there are many that have been dated in the early and middle Cypriot period, ca. 650-550.[523] She also argues that in Cypriot examples, the "statues all wear a separate belt around the waist, without a buckle."[524] While many of the Cypriot examples do not have a buckle and a separate belt, on others, the belt is made from the lion skin which is knotted around the waist; on still others, a belt that is part of the lion skin, not a separate band, is damaged where the buckle would be, so it is unclear how it was closed.[525] There is certainly variation in the statues, and not all have a buckle, but several examples wear absolutely identical dress, save the buckle; still others wear identical dress but are broken where the buckle might be. Also, in examples from Athenian vases where the lion's skin is cinched around Herakles' waist, there is a separate belt closing the skin; the belt is not

[521] M. Cristofani 1977, 2-7; cf. E. Gjerstad 1953-1973, III.454-456; A. Mura Sommella 1977, 122-128.
[522] On the Hercules and its Cypriot dress, e.g. E. Gjerstad*, et al.* 1934, pl. XXII-XXIII; M. Borda 1946-1947; V. Karageorghis*, et al.* 2000, 106 ss with references; V. Karageorghis 2003. On Cypriot contact with Central Italy: L. Bonfante and V. Karageorghis 2001
[523] E. Gjerstad*, et al.* 1934. Recent confirmation of the dating of middle Cypriot sculpture to the early sixth century can be found in S. Fourrier 2007.
[524] N. A. Winter 2009b, 379
[525] E. Gjerstad*, et al.* 1934, III. Pl. 34.400, 423.424

part of the skin as in the S. Omobono group.[526] It is possible that Rome is not the only city harnessing the Cypriot style and that Athenians to began at this time to incorporate it, but there is at present no reason to believe Romans were looking to Athens rather than Cyprus. Regardless, the S. Omobono Hercules represents a unique and noteworthy link between the East Mediterranean island and mainland Italy; for all the unmistakable similarities between the Roman and Cypriot works, though, the Roman sculpture is by no means a replica of a Cypriot type. The Cypriot works are carved in limestone and the Roman work is a made of terracotta; each material is customary for sculptors in the respective regions and requires a different skill set.[527] Also, while the distinctive dress is present in both statues, the modeling of the Roman Hercules is strikingly different from its Cypriot counterparts. He has a full body, thick buttocks and strongly modeled back that contrasts sharply with the plank-like Cypriot figures. In this regard the Roman sculpture is closer to male figures produced around the Aegean, falling more in line with volumetric fleshy forms popular in late-sixth-century Ionia and the fine line and modeling of musculature present in late-sixth-century Attic kouroi.[528] The combination of Cypriot iconography, Ionic and Attic style and Central Italic material renders the sculpture foreign to any one of its component cultures, and exceptional for Central Italy.

---

[526] For example, a ampora from the Boston Museum of Fine Arts, 98.916. K. Schefold 1993, fig. 258. Winter does not reference any vases in particular and I was unable to find any comparisons where the belt was part of the lion's skin.

[527] Cypriot sculptors also worked extensively in clay, but their terracotta sculptures are executed in a markedly different style, which suggests they were not behind the manufacture of the Roman work: Lewe 1975; E. Gjerstad 1978; S. Fourrier 2007.

[528] For example: G. M. A. Richter and I. A. Richter 1970, 113-125; A. F. Stewart 1990, esp. 120, 122, pls. 123, 132.

What is more, while the Cypriot Herakleis are single-figure sculptures, Romans chose to pair their version of the hero with Athena. She too is a mix of style and dress from across the Mediterranean; her Ionic helmet suggests eastern roots to many scholars, but her almond-shaped eyes, high cheekbones and prominent nose and lips are Ionic, Attic and Italic in equal measure.[529] The two best comparanda for her stylized lips and fleshy face are a South Italic bronze kore found at Lavinium and one of several korai from the Acropolis in Athens. Again, though, she is made of terracotta, suggesting Italic craftsmanship.

The material, iconography and style of the group are hard to reconcile if one suggests they belong to a workshop of any one of the cultures. Instead, they appear to be the product of a meeting of cultures, not purely Cypriot, Ionic, Attic or Central Italic. As with the lion pediment, the sculpture's manufacture is a mystery. It is the product of a Cypriot workshop in Rome or elsewhere in Italy, or perhaps Romans working in a popular eastern style present in painting and sculpture that moved around the Mediterranean.

Though unsure of its origins, scholars often promote the group's Aegean and East Mediterranean style and dress as evidence that the sculptures link Rome politically to Athens and the East. The suggestion rests largely on the iconography of the group: a lithe Athena with a strong Herakles moving forward through space, suggesting the divinization of the demigod, a theme that is prominent in the contemporaneous Greek world. Without question, depictions of the pair were popular in archaic Athenian

[529] E.g. A. Mura Sommella 1977, 122 with references.

sculpture and painted pottery in the years before Romans erected Temple II. In the art-historical record the most typical scenes are of Herakles' journey with Athena to Olympus and his triumphal procession after victoriously intervening in the Gigantomachy.[530] In most of these images the primary, if not only, figures are the demigod and his patron, occasionally accompanied by Zeus. Also, the vast majority of them were made and displayed in Athens, and Alan Shapiro has therefore concluded that Herakles' association with Athena was chiefly an Athenian propagandistic iconography relating to the city's patron goddess.[531] Given that that the statue of Minerva and Hercules is unique in its time to Central Italy, it is tempting to suggest a link with Athens. The pair was represented on vases that traveled all around the Mediterranean, the iconography was prevalent, but while the image of the two traveled the Mediterranean, outside of Athens, they do not appear as prominent sanctuary sculpture except in Rome—and subsequently elsewhere in Central Italy. This may suggest a link between the Rome and Athens. Given Hercules' distinctive Cypriot dress and Minerva's Ionic helmet, which are not common in Athenian images of the pair, it seems something more complicated is going on. At present this is hard to decipher, but the sculptures reveal a mixing of artistic practices that speaks of the intercultural nature of the sanctuary and its builders.

In the end, though, the sculptor's inscrutable decision to incorporate culturally distinct style, iconography and dress leaves one questioning why Romans chose such an

[530] G. Ferrari 1994-1995, 221-225; cf. Athena 2004, Athena; Herakles 2004, Herakles
[531] H. A. Shapiro 1989, 157, 161

idiosyncratic group for the temple's primary sculpture and how to interpret its relationship to the building. Scholars fervently disagree on how to read the iconography against the temple. A major obstacle is the relationship of the sculpture to the temple's dedicatee. Based on a reference in Livy, scholars agree that the *twin* temples were dedicated to Fortuna and Mater Matuta, and most concur that the two small temples below the platform would logically also be dedicated to one of those two deities.[532] *Which* of the two is unclear. Some argue that another temple, twin to the extant small buildings, remains buried under the platform; others are reluctant to make such a leap without material evidence.[533] To make matters worse, evidence for the dedicatee of the excavated small temples is ambivalent. Livy states that Servius Tullius dedicated a temple to Fortuna somewhere in Rome during the early sixth century, and many believe his reference is to the small temples at S. Omobono.[534] Yet a date for that temple ca. 580 does not match Tullius' traditional reign dates, and there is equally strong evidence, in the form of sacrificial remains and votives more typical of Mater Matuta, that the temple belongs to her.[535] What is more, in attempting to tie the sculpture to the goddesses, scholars have concluded that neither deity has close ties to Hercules or the myth of his apotheosis.[536] The link between the group and the dedicatee therefore remains a problem, but not one that is isolated to S. Omobono.

---

[532] Livy V.19, V.23 ; on the identification: A. M. Colini 1959-1960, 4; A. M. Colini 1977, 19; cf. F. Castagnoli 1979, 145-151.
[533] M. Cristofani 1990, 33.
[534] Livy V.19.6; cf. Dion. IV.27.7.
[535] G. Pisani Sartorio 1982.
[536] F. Coarelli 1981.

The enigma pervades the study of ridgepole sculpture. The best examples of the sculpture type come from Murlo, Satricum and Veii, and each site presents trouble for interpretation. At Murlo, scholars reconstruct the sculptures atop an open courtyard building of unknown function. Edlund-Berry highlights the similarity between the Murlo seated and standing ridgepole sculptures and figures depicted on that building's revetments; she concludes that both may represent divine figures.[537] The interpretation is tied to her (and the excavators') interpretation of the complex as a "*templum*, used as a political sanctuary." Beyond that, all is speculation; a precise identification of the figures, their exact relationship with the building and a full comprehension of the way an ancient viewer might read their iconography against the building remains unclear. At Veii, the fragmentary sculptural program was not found entirely *in situ*, and it is unclear whom the temple was dedicated to: probably Apollo and/or Minerva. Most scholars expect that the temple was important for both deities, and they feel comfortable interpreting most of the remaining ridgepole sculptures. One group, a Hercules and Apollo possibly fighting for the Delphic tripod, seems appropriate to at least one of the dedicatees, and a Latona holding Apollo is also easily explained (Fig. 3.89-3.90).[538] But the rest of the sculpture is absent, leading some to question how Minerva fit into the iconography.[539] If, at Veii, the extant sculptures seem at least to fit with one dedicatee, at Satricum the picture is radically different; there a trove of votive offerings indicates the temple was built for

[537] I. E. M. Edlund-Berry 1992, 205.
[538] A new interpretation of this sculpture suggests the figure is not Latona and Apollo, but Niobe and one of her children, tying the kourotrophos type to Minerva: J. Neils 2008.
[539] On the sanctuary and the sculptures, recently: C. Carlucci 2001; G. Colonna 2001.

Mater Matuta, but scholars have trouble linking any of the sculptures to her cult or the site around it.[540] Thus it seems that sometimes there was a clear dialogue between ridgepole sculpture and temple dedicatee, as with Apollo at Veii, but in other cases, as at Satricum, the connection is less apparent; the comparative evidence leaves interpretations of the sculptures at S. Omobono on a weak footing.

With so little information on the relationship between ridgepole sculptures, temples and their dedicatees, scholars have focused on another possible explanation for the iconography of the Hercules and Minerva: propaganda. Given the international (especially Aegean) style of the sculptures, they compare the function of the Roman group to Greek allegorical images found around Attica. Based on theories that link Athena and Hercules to the Peisistratid tyranny, they suggest a similar function for the Roman pair. I have proposed that iconographic and iconological comparisons of Roman and Athenian sculptures of Hercules and Minerva are not entirely justified; still, arguments for the group's *symbolism* have a following and therefore warrant consideration. John Boardman suggests that Herakles-Athena iconography from the mid sixth century indicates Peisistratos' use of the demigod's divinization as an allegory for his rise to power, and scholars of the S. Omobono sculpture suggest this finds a parallel in Roman politics. They contend that Tarquinius Superbus must have recognized the

[540] P. S. Lulof 1993; P. S. Lulof 1996.

Athenian propagandistic success and used it in his reconstruction of the temple at S. Omobono.[541]

Yet as Christer Bruun notes, scholars of Greek art no longer believe Peisistratos commissioned images of the demigod as propaganda, since myriad examples of the group predate Peisistratos' rise to power.[542] Tarquinius Superbus could not have commissioned the group in Rome in synchronicity with Athenian propaganda if there was no such allegorical function in Athens. In the wake of Bruun's argument, Patricia Lulof has noted that in the last decades of the sixth century, the group was reproduced outside of Rome at Caere, Veii, Pyrgi, and Satricum, and adds that different tyrants ruled each of these cities.[543] She doubts they used the same propaganda for the same links to Athens and asserts that the proliferation of the type indicates little more than its popularity amongst rival city-states seeking to outshine one another with grand sculpture.[544] For the cities outside Rome, her argument succeeds: in response to one city's choice, rivals might have sought to surpass them with grander sculpture.[545] But this hardly explains the initial choice of the sculpture type at Rome. If the Roman sculpture created the trend it does not follow that it was already part of that trend. Thus the question remains: why did Romans feel that a sculpture of Hercules' apotheosis was appropriate for this temple?

---

[541] E.g. C. Ampolo 1981; N. A. Winter 2005, 247-249; on the Peisistratos and the pair: J. Boardman 1972.
[542] C. Bruun 1993; cf. H. A. Shapiro 1989; but G. Ferrari 1994-1995.
[543] P. S. Lulof 2000, 207-211; Nancy Winter argues that Superbus had strong ties to each of these cities: N. A. Winter 2005, 247-249.
[544] P. S. Lulof 2000, 121; contra N. A. Winter 2005, 241-251.
[545] Others have made similar arguments for architecture: A. Snodgrass 1986.

Without a dedicatee for the temple at Rome and since ridgepole sculptures in general are difficult to interpret, and with propaganda elusive and copying for the sake of popularity a seemingly inadequate explanation for the group at Rome, the Hercules and Minerva remain a mystery. One last means of interpreting the pair may, however, present a new direction for interpreting archaic Central Italic ridgepole sculpture. Scholars have spent most of their time considering the religious and political circumstance of the group and have largely ignored its urban context. What is more, those seeking to interpret the group continually attempt to allegorize the statuary, suggesting it signifies Superbus' triumph or ties him (through various means) to the importation of the Isthmian games to Rome.[546] The work of scholars like Tonio Hölscher suggests that instead of allegory, a historical reading of the sculpture may better suit an Italic temple in early Rome.[547] If there is one space in Italy where Hercules' apotheosis would be well suited for historical commemoration, it is the Forum Boarium. The S. Omobono sculpture group directly faces the site of the Ara Maxima (dedicated to Hercules) across the Velabrum, and the myth of Hercules and his association with the Forum Boarium may very well date back to the archaic period.[548] To an audience that saw Hercules' presence in Rome as a divine sanction of their city, a sculpture commemorating him and representing the single greatest moment in the hero's tale would recall the greatness of both the demigod and their city. Such an interpretation

[546] C. Ampolo 1981; F. Coarelli 1981; F. Coarelli 1988a; F. Coarelli 1988b; N. A. Winter 2005.
[547] On narrative in early Italic, Etruscan and Roman art, e.g. M. Torelli 1982; R. Brilliant 1984; P. J. Holliday 2002; T. Hölscher 2004.
[548] T. P. Wiseman 2008, 56-57; also: T. P. Wiseman 2008.

does not account for the sculpture's place on a temple to Mater Matuta or Fortuna, but given scholars' inability to explain connections between roof sculpture and dedicatee in buildings elsewhere in early Central Italy, one should not necessarily expect that the incongruity a modern viewer perceives would translate to an ancient Roman. What is more, a new interpretation for the function of ridgepole sculptures at Veii suggests that their connection was not strictly to the deity worshiped in the temple, but more so, to the character of the religious space.[549] In her study of the sculptures, Neils suggests that the mythological figures on the roof recalled stories and lives with great moments of transition precisely because the temple was extramural, mediating the boundary of the city.

Without more evidence for the temple's dedicatee or comparanda for the relationship of ridgepole sculpture to a temple's religious function, it is impossible to know anything more precise about the sculptures' relationship with the temple. Though the question has long stumped scholars, its answerability does not define the limits of the group's significance. If the statuary's function in relation to the god worshiped is evasive, its location on the temple is not: scholars agree that the Hercules and Minerva belong on the ridgepole of the building along with at least two other coroplastic figures.[550] The temple had prominent terracotta sculpture groups lining its ridge in a style of temple decoration that finds its only comparisons within Central Italy. The group represents in microcosm the profound intercultural mixing present at the site of S.

[549] J. Neils 2008, esp. 44.
[550] A. Mura Sommella 1977, 99-112; C. Ampolo 1981, 33; A. Mura Sommella 1981, 59-64; G. Colonna 1985, 70; G. Colonna 1991; P. S. Lulof 2000, 210; N. A. Winter 2005, 244-245.

Omobono. In the Hercules and Minerva locals may have seized the contemporary popularity of a Greek myth, but they transformed it to accentuate the greatness of their own city and its divine sanction. Sculptors colored the story of Hercules' transformation from semi-human to divinity with a thoroughly eastern dress perhaps betraying their roots in Cyprus or Ionia, but they also grounded it in Attic and Central Italic volumetric and naturalistic styles with a strong sense of line and contour. Eventually architects incorporated the sculpture's Eastern and Greek iconography and style into a conspicuously local (Central Italic) architectural vocabulary when they placed it atop the temple's roof.

The sculpture of the twin temples presents a strikingly different picture. The anthemion revetments on their roofs indicate Romans' perpetuation of a sculptural motif that was common in Central Italy by the early-mid fifth century. The Capitoline Temple seems to have popularized the anthemion in terracotta revetments, and in nearly every subsequent temple in Central Italy architects chose it as the chief sima and geison decoration.[551] The twin temples fit comfortably in the new sculptural paradigm. The elaboration of the anthemion in a doubled motif, one row upright and the other hanging, is, however, new; the Rome and Ardea plaques are the earliest examples of that type and suggest Rome's continued role in setting or quickly adopting trends in Central Italy.[552] Still, it does not evidence the same pan-Mediterranean interests that earlier sculpture

[551] See chapter 4.
[552] See above, notes 425-427.

does. Just as the best model for the temple's plan and form come from nearby Central Italic sites, like Tarquinia, the revetments might suggest that Rome was looking to neighboring regions. Of course, the preserved revetments are only a small piece of what would have been a large sculptural program, and other terracottas, including ridgepole sculpture, antefixes, mouldings, column capitals and pedimental decoration may present a different picture if they are ever found.

## Urban context

The three phases of temple construction at the site indicate tremendous change and a mixing of foreign and local culture. In the first two temples, architects combined indigenous, traditional building plans with foreign sculptural styles, iconographies and forms. While cultural mixing in the temples' designs suggests foreign influences at work in Rome, votives and urban location indicate that non-locals were not just helpful in construction; they also participated in the sanctuary's use.

### *Worshipers and their votives*

Votive deposits in archaic Rome are sparse, but when present, they chiefly consist of offerings of regional manufacture or at most, imports from neighboring cities in

Etruria and Latium.[553] At S. Omobono, however, the votive deposit is notably diverse, indicating a combination of foreign and local activity at the site. The best evidence for votive character comes from the second temple, where archaeologists found equal numbers of objects with Etruscan, Latin and Greek provenances. Here, worshipers placed the well known ivory lion engraved with an Etruscan name next to other Etrusco-Corinthian ceramics (Fig. 3.15); mixed in with these offerings, other users left delicate laminated bronzes and impasto vessels that are particular to north-central Latium (Fig. 3.31); and around these votives, still more visitors donated fine Attic kylices, and Rhodian and Lydian pottery imported from Ionia (Fig. 3.91).[554] In all, worshipers laid hundreds of expensive objects from across Italy and the Mediterranean at the base of the temple.

The South Etruscan and Northern Latin votives are not out of place in archaic Rome. Objects manufactured in local or neighboring styles and with local materials characterize most deposits from the Clivus Capitolinus, the Capitoline Hill and from around the Forum and Palatine slope.[555] Still, one should not undervalue their presence in the S. Omobono record; they indicate a clear local presence and recall that however international the temple's sculpture and character, it is in Rome.[556] Scholars have long

[553] P. Virgili 1990, 130; cf. E. Gjerstad 1953-1973, II-IV; M. Cristofani 1990, 63-68, 95-96.
[554] G. Colonna 1959-1960; R. Paribeni 1959-1960; E. Gjerstad 1953-1973, III.384, 387-456; L. Daminato 1977; G. Pisani Sartorio 1977; S. Rizzo 1977; P. Virgili 1977; A. M. Colini*, et al.* 1978, 424; P. Virgili 1990; F. Gilotta 1990; A. Mura Sommella 2000a, 12-15.
[555] P. Virgili 1990, 130; cf. E. Gjerstad 1953-1973, III.190-201, 212-216, 260-309; M. Cristofani 1990, 63-68, 95-96.
[556] I will discuss below whether the sanctuary belongs to a city, a suburb, a port or an emporium. Suffice it to say, it is just 100-200 meters from other prominent Archaic Roman

seen early Rome as a melting pot of Etruscan and Latin culture, and these finds support that reading. The Etruscan finds and especially the engraved lion are among the strongest evidence that Etruscans were living in and passing through Rome. Scholars agree that Etruscan influence played a role in Rome's cultural prowess in the sixth century, and the finds at S. Omobono record that contact.[557]

On the other hand, archaeologists contend that the non-Italic finds beside the temple present an image of early Rome that is dramatically different from that scholars imagined in the mid twentieth century. As Fernando Gilotta illustrates, the quality and diversity of East Mediterranean finds at S. Omobono is exceptional and comparable only to some of the most luxurious votive deposits in archaic Central Italy.[558] He notes Lydian and Samian lekythoi, several fine Attic "eye" kylices and ceramics produced by artists like the Amasis painter, the Little Masters and the Swan group, who have a small distribution in Central Italy; the finds, he argues, constitute one of the greatest examples of the importation of Greek works in late-sixth-century Central Italy. What is more, the collection shows Rome's leading hand in the importation of these goods, as many of their painters and their styles appear in Rome at the forefront of their arrival on Italic soil.[559] These objects, their quantity and their quality find no comparison in the contemporaneous votive record of Rome and characterize the sanctuary at S. Omobono as the beneficiary of extensive and unique foreign contact.

---

buildings and if it was outside an archaic city wall, it was so visually and geographically close to the city that it should be considered part of the urban fabric.

[557] E.g. G. Colonna 1959-1960; L. Daminato 1977; S. Rizzo 1977; P. Virgili 1990.

[558] F. Gilotta 1990, 140-141.

[559] F. Gilotta 1990, 141.

Scholars conclude that the materials characterize the site as strikingly different from the rest of the archaic city.[560] A disproportionately foreign record of votive and ceremonial objects suggests a lively trade by the river that is absent from the rest of Rome, and although the Greek nature of the materials does not necessarily correlate to Greek worshipers at the site, it does signify people from outside of Rome transporting goods into the city. How long these merchants remained in Rome and whether or not it was they who delivered the votives and used the ceremonial objects at the temple is unclear. Perhaps they were passing through on their way up River to the interior of the Italian mainland; perhaps some of them remained in Rome. The finds do not help answer this question. The architecture of the city is a better barometer for that, and the sculpture in the S. Omobono temples alongside the tectonics of buildings like the Temple of Castor and Pollux or the Capitoline suggest that architects from as far as Ionia may have stayed in Rome to oversee the city's monumental buildings projects.[561] These architects would likely leave votives like those offered at the second temple of S. Omobono precisely when Romans began the Capitoline Temple.

### *The River*

Scholars agree that in the archaic period and beyond, the Tiber must have been a major trade route for Mediterranean merchants seeking to reach clients in the interior of

[560] E. Gjerstad 1953-1973, III.460-462; A. M. Colini*, et al.* 1978, 424; P. Virgili 1990; A. Mura Sommella 2000a, 12-15.
[561] See above and Chapters 1 and 3.

the Italic peninsula.[562] It is the only major waterway into northern Latium, inland south-central Etruria and the Apennines, and evidence for importation in cities like Veii, Civita Castellana, and Volsinii (Orvieto) suggest their reliance on the Tiber for trade.[563] Rome was particularly well positioned to control commerce traveling up and down the river; as Colini notes, the city is perfectly situated for stopping merchants. It is just south of a troublesome convergence with the Anio River and is situated on the northeast bank of a natural bend that would provide a comfortable haven for docking ships.[564] At that bend, just east of Tiber Island, merchants and travelers would find a slower current, eddying into the curve of the widened river.[565] The east bank of the river at this convenient bend was just forty meters from the archaic sanctuary at S. Omobono (Fig. 2.17).[566] Some scholars express concern with naming this area Rome's archaic port, but it is hard to dismiss the extraordinary suitability of the site alongside the evidence for foreign votives at a sanctuary, evidence that is largely absent in the rest of the city. What is more, archaeologists recently found a cappellaccio wall, probably dating to the sixth century, along the Tiber's east banks, and they argue it served as an early embankment wall.[567] Calculations for the Tiber's archaic elevation suggest it was four to five masl; the top of

[562] E.g. G. Bartoloni 1986, 90-110.
[563] S. Quilici Gigli 1986; M. P. Baglione 1986; G. Bartoloni 1986; C. Belardelli and A. M. Bietti Sestieri 1986; G. Colonna 1986; S. Quilici Gigli 1986; P. Santoro 1986; S. Quilici Gigli 1990; F. Zevi 1990.
[564] A. M. Colini 1980, 43-45.
[565] The gradual buildup of the shoreline and modern embankment changed this: A. J. Ammerman and D. Filippi 2004, 1-5, 14-17.
[566] A. J. Ammerman and D. Filippi 2004, 14-17.
[567] A. J. Ammerman and D. Filippi 2004, 16-17; A. J. Ammerman 2006; A. J. Ammerman 2006, 307.

the wall is just under six masl.[568] Merchants mooring boats just off the banks or even lashing their boats to the wall would comfortably be able to offload goods and passengers here, below Tiber Island, before crossing under the purported site of the Pons Sublicius. This is not to say the site west of the temples was the only port of the city, or even that it was a formal port, but evidence for a higher-than-usual foreign presence in this area of the city and its proximity to the Tiber, Rome's major trade route and an apparent source of great wealth and cultural exchange, supports the site's characterization as a city port.

The proximity of the sanctuary to the river has led scholars to suggest that it functioned specifically as a port or emporium temple.[569] The anomalous foreign nature of votive deposits and the foreign design of sculpture adorning the temple corroborates a reading of the sanctuary as mediating culture contact. It is unlikely, however, that the sanctuary functioned as an emporium temple. The high number of local finds suggests that Rome's residents and neighboring peoples who did not use the Tiber were frequenting the temple as often as foreigners; in sites that scholars identify as emporia, foreign votives constitute an overwhelming majority of deposits.[570] Also, the local architectural elements in the building's design and its proximity to Rome (much closer than emporia typically are) suggests it was a site sanctioned at least in part by locals. A sanctuary at the city's port therefore seems an appropriate identification.

---

[568] A. J. Ammerman and D. Filippi 2004, 16-17.
[569] E.g. A. M. Colini 1980, 43-45; F. Coarelli 1988b.
[570] For example, Graviscae: A. I. Nemirovsky 1982; F. Boitani and M. Torelli 1999; S. Fortunelli 2007; cf. J.-P. Morel 1975, 862.

Finally, something should be said about the experience of a traveler entering Rome by this port and proceeding to the Forum. If, as seems likely, the Vicus Iugarius was in use at this time, a viewer would arrive at the port, climb the gravel bed at the base of the Capitoline behind the sanctuary at S. Omobono.[571] In the sixth century she or he would walk behind one of the two small temples, both of which had prominent sculpture in the pediments and on the rooftop. Walking on the street, which was naturally elevated on the gravel bed behind the temple, she or he would be at eye level with the top of the temple, engaging directly with the sculpture. The situation is similar to a viewer processing into sanctuaries at Pyrgi or down the sacred way at Delphi, where sloped streets put a viewer in close visual space with temple sculpture. This would change with the twin temples, though. The base of their tall solid back walls rested just at the Vicus Iugarius and they would create a kind of wall, closing in on the south a street that was already walled in on the north by the slope of the Capitoline Hill.

### *The Velabrum and Forum Boarium*

The area south and east of the temples, the Velabrum and Forum Boarium, remains mostly unexcavated, especially down to the layers of the archaic city, and its relationship to the precinct is less clear. It is possible that it was not properly settled at this time: Coarelli notes no literary or archaeological evidence for cults or architecture in the valley until the middle of the fourth century, and cores reveal that the area was well

[571] A. J. Ammerman 2006.

below the flood level of the Tiber until the middle Republic.[572] Construction of the Servian Wall at the start of the fourth century seems to have caused an accretion of land, and a purposeful landfill under M. Fulvius Nobilior around 179 probably produced a formally raised plain ripe for construction.[573] Thus, the area was probably left free of monumental construction until the early-mid Republic. A recent study of cores taken throughout the Velabrum and Forum Boarium does, however, suggest that the lower elevations were not entirely deserted. Rather, it seems that clay beds below soil level in the Velabrum were uncovered in the late seventh century, perhaps in conjunction with the Forum landfill; the fabric of the clay is identical to that used in roof tiles throughout the city during the seventh and sixth centuries and therefore is a likely source of their manufacture.[574] If the evidence can be believed, it suggests that the Velabrum and low-lying Forum Boarium were populated with workers extracting the clay, and perhaps even kilns and worksites for the design and manufacture of architectural terracottas.[575] Workers would fire the kilns during dry periods when Romans could extract the clay, producing the city's terracotta roofs and perhaps tiles for neighboring polities. This interpretation characterizes the valley south of S. Omobono as Rome's early riverside industrial zone and fits well with the image of a port on the banks of a growing cultural and economic power at the heart of Italic-Mediterranean trade. It is of course speculative.

---

[572] On construction in the area: F. Coarelli 1988a, 60-204; on the elevation: chapter 1.
[573] F. Coarelli 1988a, 36-39.
[574] A. J. Ammerman*, et al.* 2008.
[575] A. J. Ammerman*, et al.* 2008, 26.

## VI. Conclusions

The combination of local and foreign elements in both the design of the temples and the votive objects associated with them suggests the sanctuary played a vital role in Rome's relationship with the outside world. At S. Omobono, a rich inclusion of votives and architectural and sculptural elements from Etruria, Latium, Southern Italy, Corinth, Athens, the Peloponnesus, Crete, Rhodes, Ionia, Lydia and elsewhere suggests a site not only destined for foreign merchants, travelers and expatriates, but also one that demonstrates a remarkably early and aggressive exchange with these cultures. If the foreign votives surrounded a temple of entirely local design, one might read them as evidence of foreigners frequenting a local shrine, but architects incorporated strikingly foreign elements into the temple's sculpture, suggesting a true exchange of cultural practices and ideas along the banks of the Tiber. The multicultural image of the temples and their finds as well as their location on the river indicates a sanctuary on the border, a port sanctuary, mediating between Rome and the outside world.[576] Still one cannot deny the proximity of the temple to Rome's urban center; archaic remains at the base of the Capitoline, near the Temple of Saturn, are just 200 meters to the east and the Capitoline Temple is just 150 meters up the slope behind S. Omobono. Scholars note that by the late seventh and sixth centuries, contemporaneously with the first sacred remains and temples at S. Omobono, Romans were monumentalizing the forum, orienting their city

[576] A. M. Colini 1977, 12-13; A. M. Colini 1980, 44; G. Pisani Sartorio 1990, 111.

toward the Tiber and exploiting the river as an outlet to large-scale trade.[577] The sanctuary at S. Omobono stood at the urban border, along the river, and would have been a place of transition for travelers stopping in Rome. It may also have been one of the first places that foreigners met Romans, even one of the first places that non-Italic travelers met Italic culture.

The nature of the site as a threshold for exchange cannot be overstated. Every facet of it suggests religious, artistic and cultural transition, mediation, confluence, combination and mixing. In each of the first two temples, architects at Rome mixed local plans, mouldings and raised, single-façade temples sporting frontal staircases with architectural sculpture that partook in either new or nascent styles in Central Italy. The sculpture combined patently foreign and local iconography depicting alien and indigenous myths and eastern mythological iconographies. For the first fifty years of the site's monumentalization visitors contended with a thoroughly Italic temple raised on a high podium with a new round moulding. The podium would have been new to any visitor, foreign or local, as the S. Omobono temple was (one of) the first with the design, but the single point of entry to the temple, and the primacy of the southwestern façade must have been especially striking to visitors from abroad.

Meanwhile, the pedimental sculpture, while established in temples in the Greek east and west, was new to Central Italy, and given the absence of comparanda, would have been unusual for visitors from nearby. As other temples with unsculpted sloped

[577] C. Belardelli and A. M. Bietti Sestieri 1986, 63-69; S. Quilici Gigli 1986, 71-89; G. Colonna 1988a, 467-515; M. Cristofani 1990, 9-145; T. Cornell 1995, 81-118, 198-214; G. E. Meyers 2003, 162-169; G. Forsythe 2005, 80.

gables and open pediments went up in neighboring lands, the Roman temple would have stood in isolation of a growing tradition. In the second temple, visitors met a similarly local moulding on the podium, though again the newness of the S. Omobono double round is highlighted by the absence of contemporaneous comparanda. Its avant-garde incorporation into the design may mark the temple as distinct from its contemporaries in Central Italy, but it was still a raised, single façade temple, exhibiting strong local architectural forms. Furthermore, evidence for identical revetments and terracotta sculpture at Veii and Velletri near Rome suggests the continuation of an early-sixth-century tradition of ceramic production in and around Rome and a local influence on the temple's new sculptural program. By contrast, the terracotta sculptures of Hercules and Minerva are the earliest known example of their type in Central Italy and suggest a new direction in style and iconography infiltrating Roman sculpture from outside the Italic peninsula. Hercules' Cypriot iconography and Athena's Ionic helmet, the combination of the two figures in one acroterial group, their Ionicizing and Attic volumetric style and modeling, and the markedly Athenian and eastern Greek history associated with them indicates a strong foreign influence on Rome at the end of the sixth century.

Alongside the changing styles of temples and sculpture around the city, especially present in the Capitoline, the influence speaks of Rome's openness, drawing on foreign themes, styles, craftsmanship and culture in an era of monumental construction projects demonstrating profound wealth and aspirations. On a small scale, the Hercules and Minerva suggest Rome's burgeoning power; soon after their commission for the S. Omobono temple, sculptors throughout Central Italy emulated the pair. Whether

through direct influence or simply a growing interest in the myth; whether resulting from hegemonic doctrine and temple patronage under expelled kings or simply a popularity fostered by open communication and intercultural competition, the emulation of the sculptural group outside of Rome suggests the city's rising cultural impact. It suggests that either through active or passive domination, art at Rome was serving as a benchmark around the region. The double round moulding on the second temple podium would also soon be copied throughout Central Italy, first at Ardea; it became one of the most commonly reproduced in Central Italic architecture during the Roman Republic.[578] One cannot say for sure that the second temple at S. Omobono is the first to possess these elements, but no other example predates those found in Rome. If the temple is not the first to promote these styles, it does seem to have stood at the forefront of their popularity.

The image of the temples presents a new sense of Rome in the sixth century. It suggests that Romans were participating in the popularization of Central Italic architectural and sculptural trends, if not creating them outright; simultaneously, it signifies that Romans were mixing their local culture with others from around the Mediterranean. A city that just a century before had been confined to hilltops, building out of wattle and daub, and seasonally running for high ground was by the early sixth century open to the Mediterranean. By the end of that century, the city would be one of the most monumental in Central Italy, laying claim to the peninsula's largest temple, on the Capitoline. Within another half century, just as architects had finished the

[578] I. E. M. Edlund-Berry 2008, 442.

monumental Temple of Castor in the Forum and paved the open space in stone, it seems Romans set to task on a third temple complex at the foot of the Capitoline, this one in a strikingly indigenous style with thoroughly local anthemion revetments. The new twin temples of Fortuna and Mater Matuta would have stood prominently on the banks of the Tiber facing south toward ships advancing up the river; they were a monumental greeting and would have served as a gateway between Rome and the Mediterranean, a new colossal façade for the city. Combined on a single platform the twin buildings created a truly overwhelming sight for visitors entering Rome from the Tiber. Individually each matched other monumental temples like those at Pyrgi, Caere and Satricum; together, their roofs nearly touching over the central passageway, they were almost fifty meters wide, nearly as expansive as the Capitoline. The unity of the platform and its height and isolation above the surrounding area of the Velabrum, Campus Martius and Tiber banks would have joined the double superstructures in a viewer's eye, creating a temple complex whose scale and wealth of material was eclipsed in Central Italy only by the Capitoline Temple, looming overhead.

Evidence from the portside sanctuary at S. Omobono reveals that Rome had, by the early sixth century, opened its doors to the outside world: architects on the site looked to Greek and eastern styles to decorate their buildings, foreigners began flooding Rome's shores and by the end of the century, with the second temple, they left hundreds of votives and ceremonial objects, recording their presence on the site. The finds around the temple do more than just characterize the kinds of objects worshipers left behind,

they reveal a bustling trade at the shores of the city of Rome. In the last chapter, I suggested that architecture in the Forum revealed Romans' escalating interest in foreign cultures and styles; evidence from S. Omobono suggests something more profound. It indicates directly the presence of foreigners on the banks of the Tiber at Rome and in conjunction with the profound mixing of styles in the temples' sculpture, it reveals acute culture contact in the sixth-century city. Rome was evidently home to foreigners, and their influence on Rome's architecture had just begun; in the Capitoline Temple, foreign architectural engineering and design would help Romans create one of the most lavish and colossal buildings in the contemporaneous Mediterranean.

# Chapter 4

## The Temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus on the Capitoline

In cities throughout the Roman empire, the presence of a capitolium on the forum signified Roman rule under the sanction of Jupiter, his consort, Juno, and daughter, Minerva. Icons of Roman domination, these temples find their architectural and religious roots in the Temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus on the Capitoline Hill in Rome. Dionysius of Halicarnassus describes the Capitoline Temple as a colossal triple-cella temple roughly two hundred Roman feet square with lateral colonnades and a deep, hexastyle, triple-colonnaded porch; he and other authors state that two of Rome's last kings, the Tarquins, built it in the sixth century BCE and that despite numerous repairs and a few reconstructions, Romans maintained its original plan for over half a millennium.[579] The temple Dionysius describes is enormous; it outstrips the width of the Temple of Artemis at Ephesus and would have remained the largest temple in the Italic Peninsula until the second century CE.[580] Pliny the Elder describes its central acroterial statue of Jupiter on a quadriga as a masterpiece of architectural sculpture "more admired than gold"; it was purportedly the work of famous Etruscan sculptor, Vulca of Veii, who

[579] Dion., IV.61.3-4.

[580] The Temple of Artemis at Ephesus is recorded as 51 m wide: D. G. Hogarth*, et al.* 1908, 288 Plate I; recent excavations of the Capitoline Temple record its foundations as 54 m wide: A. Mura Sommella 2000a, 21. See below on debates of the Capitoline Temple's size. In the Italic Peninsula, the first known temple larger than the Capitoline is the Temple of the Divine Trajan; contra: A. Claridge 2007, 70-74.

fashioned it for the temple upon the request of Tarquinius Priscus.[581] Scholars have highlighted several reasons for the temple's splendor: some say it replaced the Temple of Jupiter Latiarius as the primary sanctuary of the Latins; others suggest the Tarquin kings built it as a symbol of their usurpation of Rome or as a symbol of the city's growing economy.[582] It housed the Sibylline books, Rome's first and most famous oracle, and set the climax of the Roman triumph, when the celebrated imperator stood opposite Vulca's over-life-size, enthroned, enrobed sculpture of Jupiter in the central cella, the faces of statue and man painted red in celebration of victory.[583]

The temple should be among the most important buildings in histories of Roman architecture; yet its story and reconstruction are problematic, and so, it has become one of the most avoided.[584] The trouble arises largely because the only archaeological remains of the temple are its foundations and a few revetments, making a full reconstruction difficult, and furthermore, those remains and literary evidence suggests a temple of a size that is unmatched in the contemporaneous Italic peninsula; some

[581] Pliny *NH*, 35.157. Also, Plut. *Life of Poplicola*, 13, Fest., 274.
[582] Cf. A. Boëthius*, et al.* 1994; G. Tagliamonte 1996, 145; P. J. E. Davies 2006, 187-190
[583] Plut. *Life of Poplicola*, 13, Fest., 274; that the imperator's face was painted red is not entirely for sure: M. Beard 2007.
[584] D. S. Robertson 1945, 200 gives the Capitoline Temple 10 lines with no suggestion of its relevance to the history of Rome or its architecture; rather it is included briefly in a longer analysis of Etruscan temples as predecessors to Roman architecture. F. Coarelli*, et al.* 1980, a book on the most important temples of Italy, devotes several pages to Temples A and B at Pyrgi, the Ara della Regina at Tarquinia and the temples at Marzabotto, but does not even mention the Capitoline Temple in Rome. A. Boëthius*, et al.* 1994, 41-42 calls it "mighty," and includes it in the section on Etruscan temples, but does not highlight any significance for Roman architectural history. Frank Sear does much the same, including the temple amongst Etruscan predecessors to Roman architecture: F. Sear 1989, 10-11. Frank Brown does not mention the temple at all : F. E. Brown 1961. Only Pierre Gros and Penelope Davies suggest that it was an important step in the genesis of Roman architecture: P. Gros 2006, 136-137; P. J. E. Davies*, et al.* 2007, 179.

historians doubt that a subjugated or nascent city, like archaic Rome, could produce such monumental architecture. Scholars have therefore attacked the traditional date and size of the superstructure, suggesting either that the remains belong to a fourth century BCE reconstruction or that, while the extant foundations do in fact date to the sixth century, the superstructure occupied only part of their surface.[585] For those who believe the temple is both archaic and colossal, doubt remains about the history of early Rome, the temple's purported tyrannical builders and their intentions.

In this chapter I present new arguments for the plan and design of the archaic Capitoline Temple and suggest the building both marks early Rome as a prominent, culturally open city and sparked a sea change in temple design that would endure for a millennium. Based on recent archaeological findings and on a comparative analysis with contemporaneous architecture in Italy and the Mediterranean, I suggest the remains not only date to the late sixth century, but they also belong to a colossal temple. In this building, architects combined daring innovation with conventional architectural elements from Central Italic and Mediterranean buildings. They established several fundamental aspects of Italic and Roman temple design, and architects throughout Central Italy began adopting the assemblage of foreign and local elements on the heels of the Capitoline's completion. Their rapid interest in emulating a major Roman temple suggests that as early as the late sixth century Rome exerted a potent influence on the culture (if not the

[585] On a much later date for the temple: H. Riemann 1969, 118; J. Martinez-Pinna 1980, 251. On the superstructure not filling the surface of the foundations: F. Castagnoli 1955; F. Castagnoli 1966-1967, 73-74; F. Castagnoli 1974, 435; C. F. Giuliani 1982, 31; F. Castagnoli 1984, 3-20; J. W. Stamper 2005, 21-27; P. L. Tucci 2006, 390; R. B. Ulrich 2007, 134.

politics) of Central Italy. What is more, it anchors the genesis of Roman temple design squarely in Rome, on the Capitoline in the late sixth century.

## I. Dating the remains of the Temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus

Livy and Dionysius both state that Tarquinius Priscus began the Capitoline Temple in the early sixth century BCE. Livy notes that Priscus laid the foundations, while Dionysius states only that he "began work."[586] Cicero reports that Priscus vowed the temple.[587] These authors also state that Tarquinius Superbus began building the temple in earnest in the late sixth century and that Marcus Horatius Pulvillus dedicated it either in 509 or 507 BCE as a first consul of the Republic.[588] Though some scholars regard the temple's inauguration date as one of the earliest confirmable textual records in Roman history, others suggest that the literary tradition cannot be trusted or that one must read it with skepticism.[589] Debate of the textual sources led early-twentieth-century scholars to search material remains for confirmation of the temple's date. In the face of an archaeological lacuna, Hans Riemann argued the text was inaccurate: while Dionysius reports that the temple stood unharmed from 509 to the early first century

[586] Livy, I.38.7, Dion., III.69.1.
[587] Cic. *de rep.,* II.20.36.
[588] Cic. *de rep.,* II.24.44, Livy, I.53.2-3, II.8.6 Dion., III.69.2, IV.59.1, V.35.3. For further sources, see G. Tagliamonte 1996, 145.
[589] Those who uphold or follow the literary tradition include R. Bloch 1961, 68; G. Colonna 1981a, 43-48; A. Mura Sommella 1997; A. Mura Sommella 2000a, 21-23; A. Mura Sommella 2000b, 60, 72; A. Danti 2001, 342; P. J. E. Davies 2006, 187. Those who question the historicity of the date include E. Gjerstad 1953-1973, V; T. Cornell 1995, 128; T. P. Wiseman 1995a, 135; G. Tagliamonte 1996, 146.

BCE, it instead must have burned during the Gaulic sack of 390.[590] The extant foundations, Riemann argues, must date to an unrecorded reconstruction after the sack. Without remains to provide a secure *terminus ante quem* and in consideration of Riemann and others' arguments, scholars have long debated the likelihood that extant foundations date to the sixth century.[591]

Recent excavations have laid these questions to rest. Between 1998 and 2000, archaeologists found evidence that the existing foundations of the Capitoline Temple date to the late sixth century. Confirmation of the traditional date comes from finds in the deep, wide foundation trenches that workers dug to lay the enormous stone substructure of the temple. As they laid stones and the foundations rose, builders backfilled the workspace of the trenches with earth and debris until they reached ground level (Fig. 4.1, 4.2). At that point they deposited a thin, even layer of earth in preparation for or as a pavement.[592] During excavations, archaeologists removed the top paving layer and the backfill from these trenches and analyzed the debris; they also studied finds in contexts connected with the trenches.[593]

The top paving layer covered the foundation trenches and therefore indicates the end of work on the temple substructure; in this top layer, excavators found remains of loom weights, small ovens, dolii and other household and cooking wares that date from

[590] H. Riemann 1969, 118.
[591] P. L. Tucci 2006, 387.
[592] A. Danti 2001, 334-341; M. Albertoni and I. Damiani 2008, Fig. 21.
[593] A. Danti 2001, 334-342.

the seventh to the mid-sixth centuries.[594] The end of work on the foundations therefore dates to the mid sixth century or later. [595] Excavators found similar objects dating between the seventh and early-mid sixth century in the lowest levels of the foundation-trench fill, indicating that builders would also have begun refilling the trenches no earlier than the mid sixth century.[596] What is more, excavators found that when creating the foundation trenches builders cut a late-seventh- to early-sixth-century burial; again this indicates a sixth century date for the foundation trench (Fig. 4.3).[597] Based on these finds, excavators conclude workers would have both begun and completed the foundations during or after the mid sixth century.[598]

With a *terminus post quem* established, archaeologists look to the trench and associated finds to determine the latest possible date of construction. The high volume of seventh and sixth century objects in the fill and the absence of late-sixth and fifth century objects strongly suggests that construction occurred *soon* after the middle of the sixth century: one would be unlikely to find only seventh and sixth century objects in a late-fifth- or fourth-century fill.[599] In addition to the suggestive evidence of the fill, excavators found a well on the east side of the temple; it is made of curved terracotta tiles set directly into the clay of the hill (Fig. 4.4). [600] The top of the well is flush with the paving layer that covers the trenches; Mura Sommella suggests it signals the final phase

[594] A. Danti 2001, 342; M. Albertoni and I. Damiani 2008, 18.
[595] A. Danti 2001, 334-336; M. Albertoni and I. Damiani 2008, 18.
[596] A. Danti 2001, 334-341.
[597] Tomb 16: A. Danti 2001, 334.
[598] A. Danti 2001, 342.
[599] A. Danti 2001, 334-341.
[600] A. Mura Sommella 2000a, 21-23; M. Albertoni and I. Damiani 2008, 60-61, Fig. 68.

of work on the temple.[601] The well's production technique and finds at its bottom date to the late archaic period, probably the very end of the sixth century.[602] During excavations archaeologists also found terracotta revetments belonging to the Capitoline Temple (Fig. 4.5, 4.6).[603] Their anthemion relief dates stylistically to the very late sixth century, Mura Sommella and others suggest ca. 510-500.[604] Revetments are among the last elements builders attach to a temple, and so, these indicate the completion of the Capitoline Temple between 510 and 500. Based on the date in the late sixth century of the terracottas and well (objects that mark the end of temple construction), archaeologists suggest a *terminus ante quem* ca. 500 BCE.[605]

Archaeological evidence therefore indicates the extant foundations of the Capitoline Temple and the production of its revetments date between ca. 550 and ca. 500. Mura Sommella and Danti both stress that this archaeological chronology confirms Dionysius and Cicero's histories of the Capitoline Temple. That is, Tarquinius Superbus began the Capitoline Temple, and the first consuls of the Republic dedicated it ca. 509/7.[606] Giovanni Colonna notes, however, that this reading does not account for Priscus' purported commission of Vulca's famous statues of Jupiter.[607] He suggests that Priscus commissioned the statue and built a small structure to house it until he could

[601]A. Mura Sommella 2000a, 21-23.
[602] A. Mura Sommella 2000a, 21-23; A. Mura Sommella 2002, 319.
[603] A. Mura Sommella 2000a, 24-26. The size of the revetments indicates they belong to a colossal temple, and there are no other known buildings of such a scale in the vicinity.
[604] A. Mura Sommella 2000a, 24-26.
[605] A. Mura Sommella 2000a, 24-26.
[606] A. Mura Sommella 2000a, 26; A. Mura Sommella 2000b, 72; A. Danti 2001, 243.
[607] G. Colonna 1981a, 41-59. Colonna made this argument long before Mura Sommella's excavations in response to earlier suggestions that the temple was Superban in date.

build the temple proper.[608] Colonna identifies the small structure in architectural and terracotta remains just southeast of the Capitoline Temple.[609] The argument is compelling, and it is even possible that Priscus vowed or began work on a Temple to Jupiter Optimus Maximus; still, the date of the foundation trench indicates that the extant temple was not his. Priscus' temple must have been destroyed and rebuilt anew or was never begun. Of course, scholars do not agree on the Tarquins' reign dates or even that they existed, and so one must remain cautious when assigning buildings to their names. Nevertheless, Dionysius' date for the temple does correspond with archaeological evidence: both demonstrate that Romans built the temple on the Capitoline in the late sixth century BCE.

## II. Remains of the archaic Temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus

In 1875, Rodolfo Lanciani described the early modern spoliation of walls around the Palazzo Caffarelli on the Capitoline Hill and examined their remains; he concluded that they were foundations of the Temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus.[610] Roberto Paribeni and Guglielmo Gatti further excavated and reported on the foundations in the early 1920s.[611] Following several decades of study and excavation in collaboration with

[608] G. Colonna 1981a, 41-59.
[609] G. Colonna 1981a, 41-59; for the remains of a structure just east of the Capitoline Temple: E. Gjerstad 1953-1973, III.190.
[610] R. Lanciani 1875, 165-189; for a history of the finds of the Capitoline Temple: G. Cifani 2008, 81-84.
[611] R. Paribeni 1921, 38-49.

Antonio Colini, Einar Gjerstad published the remains of six of the temple's foundation walls in volumes three and four of *Early Rome*; he also suggested a plan for the temple that became the canonical reconstruction.[612] In 1962 and 1979, Tony Hackens and Claudio Pietrangeli excavated and studied two new walls behind and beneath the Palazzo Caffarelli adding them to the list of foundations and structures related to the temple.[613] After recent excavations, Mura Sommella, Danti and others published eight previously unknown or unpublished foundation walls, reinterpreted several known walls and recorded the discovery of architectural terracottas.[614] In 2008, Gabriele Cifani published more evidence for foundations based on his archival research and argued for a new foundation plan.[615] The temple remains today in a total of sixteen colossal foundation walls and several fragments of abnormally large terracotta revetments. Scholars continue to debate the location, size and even existence of certain foundations walls, and so an analysis of their excavation and study is necessary before one can determine an overall plan and its significance.

**Assembling evidence for the foundations**

Based on Lanciani, Gatti and Paribeni's finds and on his own explorations, Gjerstad assembled a foundation plan that remained largely unquestioned for almost fifty

[612] E. Gjerstad 1953-1973, III.169-184, IV.388-398.
[613] T. Hackens 1962, 9-26; C. Pietrangeli 1976, 123-126, fig. p. 125.
[614] A. Mura Sommella 2000a, 7-26; A. Mura Sommella 2000b, 57-59; A. Danti 2001, 331-338; A. Mura Sommella 2001, 262-264.
[615] G. Cifani 2008, 85-98.

years (Fig. 4.7). In *Early Rome, III* he suggests that the remaining foundations comprise four perimeter walls and two internal walls; the perimeter walls form a rectangle with the short, front side facing south, over the Velabrum (henceforth, walls I, and VI-VIII: Fig. 4.7).[616] He also identifies two walls inside the rectangular perimeter: the so-called Muro Romano (henceforth, wall a: Fig. 4.7, a) and a short section of a wall running parallel to it (henceforth, wall b: Fig. 4.7, b). The two internal walls occupy the eastern half of the rectangular perimeter and are parallel to the side (longitudinal) perimeter walls; Gjerstad hypothesizes that they connected to the front and rear (transverse) perimeter walls and further suggests that two more internal longitudinal walls mirrored them in the western portion of the temple foundations (henceforth walls c and d: Fig. 4.7, c d).[617] These four internal walls, he says, must have supported the interior superstructure of the temple.[618] The perimeter of his foundations measures 62.25 m long 53.50 m wide.[619] Gjerstad also notes that the remains of wall a, the Muro Romano, are much taller than the other walls, rising some four meters over the ground level of the Capitoline Hill; what is more, he notes that at the elevation where other foundation walls stop, the width of wall a contracts 10-20 cm.[620] Based on the change in width and on the height of the wall above ground level, Gjerstad suggests the smaller, upper portion of the wall is part of the temple podium rather than foundations. Results of recent excavations corroborate Gjerstad's suggestion (Fig. 4.8). A thin stratum of smooth earth capped foundation

[616] E. Gjerstad 1953-1973, III.168-176 with references.
[617] E. Gjerstad 1953-1973, III.168-176.
[618] E. Gjerstad 1953-1973, III.168-176.
[619] E. Gjerstad 1953-1973, III.178 with references.
[620] E. Gjerstad 1953-1973, III.174.

trenches at the precise elevation where Gjerstad notes the change in the width of wall a; Mura Sommella's team identifies this stratum as the archaic ground level of the Capitoline Hill.[621]

In 1962 Hackens presented findings from an investigation of Vatican records and identified a wall (henceforth, wall e) attached to wall VII, Gjerstad's rear perimeter wall (Fig. 4.9).[622] Hackens' wall extends twelve meters beyond Gjerstad's rear wall and is structurally bonded to it, the stones of the two walls interweaving at the point of juncture (Fig. 4.9, 4.10).[623] Hackens proposed that the wall is related to the Capitoline Temple foundations but does not specify how. In 1979, Pietrangeli published a map of the temple's foundations for the Commune; it shows all known substructures. One wall appears for the first time on his map (henceforth, wall f); it is perpendicular to and west of wall b (Fig. 4.11).[624]

In the 1990s archaeologists excavated the Palazzo Caffarelli, the Giardino Romano (now the exedra section of the Capitoline Museums) and the area around the Muro Romano, revealing eight previously unknown foundation walls. Under the Palazzo Caffarelli, they found more of Gjerstad's perimeter (Fig. 4.12, j, k, l, m), the Muro Romano (Fig 4.12, $a^1$) and parallel wall b (Fig. 4.12, $b^1$); they also found the two western internal longitudinal walls, c and d, that Gjerstad had hypothesized (Fig. 4.12 c, d).[625]

---

[621] A. Danti 2001, 342.
[622] T. Hackens 1962, 16-21, figs. 12, 13, 14.
[623] T. Hackens 1962, 16-21, figs. 12, 13, 14. Excavations behind the rear of wall e found no trace of construction, confirming that the wall maintains its original length.
[624] C. Pietrangeli 1976, fig. on page 125.
[625] A. Mura Sommella 2000b, 62-67; A. Danti 2001, 339-343.

Under the palazzo and in a small excavation adjacent to the Muro Romano excavators also discovered three transverse walls (henceforth, walls g, h and i) that connect internal longitudinal foundations (Fig. 4.12 g, h, i).[626] Walls g and h mirror one another's position in the north half of the perimeter, and wall i aligns with Pietrangeli's wall f. In addition to the discovery of these walls, Mura Sommella reinterprets Hackens' wall (e) alongside two previously recorded walls, n and o (fig. 4.12 e, n, o).[627] Scholars previously interpreted these as terracing or fortification walls for the Capitoline Hill.[628] Mura Sommella draws attention to Hackens' work, noting that the walls follow the same orthogonal lines and the blocks are cut to the same scale and laid on the same grid as the other Capitoline Temple foundation walls. Furthermore, as Hackens notes, wall e is structurally bonded to the Temple's foundations.[629] The rear of walls n and o is 12 m north of the rear of wall VII, as is the rear of wall e.[630] Based on the bond between Gjerstad's foundations and Hackens' and on the orthogonal correspondence of walls e, n

[626] A. Mura Sommella 2000b, 62-63; A. Danti 2001, 341, fig. 313.
[627] R. Paribeni 1921, 45, 38-39; A. Mura Sommella 2000b, 62 with references.
[628] E.g. E. Gjerstad 1953-1973, III.27-30, Figs. 23-25.
[629] A. Mura Sommella 2000b, 62 with references. Gjerstad interprets the corner wall "l" as a Capitoline Hill fortification: E. Gjerstad 1953-1973, III.27-30, Figs. 23-25. He compares it, as had Jordan (H. Jordan 1885, 67 n. 67), to Ficoroni's 18th century drawing of remains on the Capitoline: F. Ficoroni 1744, 41-43 and fig. 42. But Ficoroni's wall with its two 90-degree turns must be wall "p," rather than the simple corner wall "l."
[630] A. Mura Sommella 2000b, 62-67. L Schupmann had noticed the 74 m length of the foundations when he measured them between 1865 and 1876: H. Jordan 1876, 147. Cifani agrees with the inclusion of these walls in his consideration of the Capitoline Temple, but then excludes them from his plan, arguing they are *not* part of the temple: G. Cifani 2008, 85-98, 101, 103). While Mura Sommella suggests it was under the same roof and was part of the 'tempio': Mura Sommella 2000b, 8. Cifani suggests a separate roof for the rear part and that it was just part of the '*area capitolina*': G. Cifani 2008, 103. In any case, they seem most certainly to have been part of a shared *templum*, and Hackens demonstrates clearly that they were without question connected as a single set of foundations.

and o to Gjerstad's foundations, Mura Sommella suggests that these rear segments constitute the north edge of the Capitoline Temple foundations, and so, she argues that the Temple's foundations should be measured as ca. 74 x 54 m rather than the traditional 62 x 54 m.[631]

With more walls exposed, Danti and Mura Sommella record several new measurements that help determine the width and height of the foundation walls with precision; there is, however, inconsistency in the publication of these measurements. Gjerstad, Danti and Mura Sommella agree that walls VII and VIII (the north and south perimeter walls) are 8 m wide.[632] Excavators do not agree, however, on the widths of walls I and VI (the west and east perimeter walls) or walls a-d (the four interior longitudinal walls). Danti notes that I and VI are 6.9 m wide and walls a-d 3.85 m wide.[633] Mura Sommella states that walls I and VI are 6 m wide and walls a-d 4 m wide.[634] Both authors disagree with Gjerstad, who states that wall I is between 6 and 6.25 m wide and walls a-d 4.15 m wide.[635] My own measurement of the width of wall I, the western perimeter wall, is 6.90 m, as Danti states. The full width of wall VI is not uncovered, but its widest visible section is 6.35 m, larger than Mura Sommella and Gjerstad's measurements. Blocks in this section of the foundations are between 56.8 and 64.7 cm wide, and so, one more row of stones would bring the width of this wall close to

[631] A. Mura Sommella 2000a, 21.
[632] E. Gjerstad 1953-1973, III.174; A. Mura Sommella 2000b, 67; A. Danti 2001, 343.
[633] A. Danti 2001, 343.
[634] A. Mura Sommella 2000b, 67.
[635] E. Gjerstad 1953-1973, III.174. The full width of the wall was not excavated when Gjerstad was writing.

6.90 m.[636] Walls I and VI therefore probably both measure 6.9 m wide, as Danti states. Of the interior longitudinal walls, a and d are the only ones whose entire widths are exposed.[637] My own measurement of wall a at the height where Gjerstad proposes it is podium rather than foundation coincides with Danti's measurement of 3.85 m.[638] A measurement of wall d (at foundation level) comes to 3.99 m. Gjerstad notes that the podium walls (which only survive in wall a) are 10-20 cm thinner than foundation walls below, and so, Danti's 3.85-m measurement should correspond to the podium and Mura Sommella's 4 m measurement to the foundations.

Excavators also measured the height of temple foundations and podium. Upon confirming the elevation of ground level around the Capitoline Temple at 45.4 masl, Danti and Mura Sommella state that the podium is 4.15 m tall and the foundations 12.3 m deep.[639] That is a combined height of 16.8 m. The podium height is correct, but the foundation measurement is off. Figure 26 in Danti's report shows the lowest course of foundations at 37 masl (figs. 4.2, 4.8, 4.13).[640] This is 8.4 m below the Capitoline's ground level, rather than 12.3 m; measurements taken at the site confirm a foundation depth of 8.4 m.[641] The combined height of foundation and podium is therefore 12.75 m.

---

[636] These and all measurements of the Capitoline Temple were taken on 28 January 2008 with both a Leica Disto A6 and a tape measure. Thanks to Erik Gustafson for aiding in measurements.
[637] The entire extent of the other internal walls, III and IV has not been excavated.
[638] On the discrepancy between foundation and podium, see above.
[639] A. Danti 2001, 343. Cf. A. Mura Sommella 2001, 262-264 who states that the podium is ca. four m tall, but also that her measurements are not exact.
[640] A. Danti 2001, fig. 26.
[641] A. Danti 2001, fig. 26 The lowest block of the foundations is still visible in the current exhibition of wall VI in the Exedra of the Capitoline Museums (Fig. 4.13).

Evidence from the Mura Sommella's excavations and previous study reveal a total of 21 segments of verifiable foundation and podium walls: Gjerstad's walls I-IV and a-d, Hackens' wall e, Pietrangeli's wall f and walls $a^1$, $b^1$ and g-o. Several of these walls are clearly associated with one another and present clear evidence for a plan of foundations. Combining Gjerstad's and the Mura Sommella's perimeter walls and internal longitudinal walls results in a rectangle with four long internal walls, (henceforth, I-VIII: Fig. 4.14). In light of the Commune and Pietrangeli's transverse walls (henceforth, IX-XII), a fifth transverse wall is likely between walls II and III and in line with walls XI and XII; thus wall XIII. Walls e (henceforth, XIV) and n-o, suggest foundations behind wall VII. Sections n and o would have connected to the main structure and to one another, thus walls XV-XVII. Finally, Mura Sommella neglects a wall spur between e and n; extending this creates wall XVIII and its probable twin, XIX.[642] This foundation plan corresponds closely to Danti's plan and Cifani's new reconstruction, but there are a few significant differences that must be addressed.[643]

To Paribeni's, Gjerstad's, Hackens', Pietrangeli's and Mura Sommella's foundation plans, Cifani adds several foundations that Henri Jordan records having seen in the late nineteenth century (Fig. 4.15).[644] One of these segments, Cifani's 8a, creates a dilemma (Fig. 4.16). It is a small comma-shaped segment in line with transverse walls XI-XIV between walls I and II. Based on this segment Cifani hypothesizes that walls

[642] A. Mura Sommella 2000b, 64.
[643] G. Cifani 2008, 85-98.
[644] H. Jordan 1876, 145-172; H. Jordan 1885, 66-69; G. Cifani 2008, 85-98, catalogue numbers 86a, 86b, 88a, 10bis, 22a, 23a, 83.

IX-X and XI-XIV were part of two continuous lines of transverse foundations that connected all six longitudinal walls, forming a grid.[645] There are several problems with this reconstruction.

While archaeologists largely believe the existence of Jordan's walls, they do not include them in plans of the Capitoline Temple substructures.[646] This is primarily because Jordan's plan is neither proportionally accurate nor to scale; consequently his additions to the known foundations cannot be mapped with accuracy (Fig. 4.17).[647] For example, he identifies several foundations in the grottos of the Capitoline Hill; these are the foundations that Pietrangeli and the Commune later accurately mapped through excavation and systematic measurements. Thus, archaeologists found that Jordan's foundations do exist but in entirely different locations from those he proposes (cf. b, f, i in Fig. 4.12).[648] In his drawing, Jordan locates segment 8a beside the middle portion of the exterior wall of the southwest branch of the Palazzo Caffarelli (Fig. 4.15). A comparison of Jordan's plan with the Mura Sommella's plan of recent excavations indicates this location is north of transverse walls XI-XIV, not in line with them *and* that the segment could be a portion of longitudinal wall II (Fig. 4.18). Which part of the temple foundations it belongs to is impossible to say at present. Given his plan's

[645] G. Cifani 2008, 105, fig. 170, 185.
[646] cf. R. Paribeni 1921; E. Gjerstad 1953-1973, III.168-184, figs. 115, 116, esp. p. 170 n. 161; C. Pietrangeli 1976, 125; A. Mura Sommella 2000a; A. Danti 2001, 328, fig. 321, fig. 326.
[647] E. Gjerstad 1953-1973, III.170 n. 171; Cifani also notes the problem in his reference to section 6a: G. Cifani 2008, 91.
[648] Gjerstad states that they are there, but that there is no way to relate their location to the other known foundations: E. Gjerstad 1953-1973, III.170 n. 171. This was later corrected: C. Pietrangeli 1976, 123-126, fig. p. 125; A. Mura Sommella 2000b, 62-63; A. Danti 2001, 341.

inconsistency and the resulting inability to confirm the existence or location of his foundation segments and given that past excavators (Paribeni, Gjerstad, Hackens, Pietrangeli and Mura Sommella) could not re-locate, verify or in some cases believe Jordan's additions, one should not include them in a reconstruction of the temple.

The absence of Jordan's foundation segment is not proof positive that the Capitoline foundations do not form a grid, but excavations in the areas where Cifani proposes the continuation of transverse walls have demonstrated an absence of such substructures. Mura Sommella's team excavated the area between walls V and VI from the north face of Wall VIII (the south perimeter wall) to the north end of the Muro Romano (Fig. 4.19, E). In the course of their work they found no transverse wall.[649] L. Schupmann excavated the same area between the Muro Romano and Wall VI (Fig. 4.15, y).[650] He dug 2.3 meters into the ground below the Palazzo Caffarelli and found no trace of archaic foundations.[651] Mura Sommella's team also performed soundings and excavations between walls I and II, II and IV and V and VI (Fig. 4.19, F, G, H). Again, they found no transverse walls.[652] Two soundings between walls III and IV penetrated 3 and 6 m finding nothing but fill (see fig. 4.8).[653] Mura Sommella and Schupmann's teams have therefore excavated or performed soundings throughout the length of the area between walls V and VI and in two other areas where Cifani proposes transverse walls.

---

[649] A. Danti 2001, 325-327. Cf. G. Cifani 2008, 103. Here Cifani agrees that Mura Sommella's excavations of 2001 found that longitudinal wall V was not connected to the side wall VI..
[650] H. Jordan 1876, 152-153; H. Jordan 1885, fig. 66.
[651] H. Jordan 1876, 152-153; H. Jordan 1885, fig. 66.
[652] A. Danti 2001, 325-327, Fig. 321; contra: Cifani G. Cifani 2008, 92.
[653] A. Danti 2001, 325-327, Fig. 321, 326.

In all their work they have found no evidence for a transverse wall. One might argue that the transverse walls once existed, but were either removed or collapsed; in the case of the Capitoline foundations, however, this is highly unlikely. The existing transverse walls, IX-XI are bonded to the longitudinal walls, their masonries interweaving at points of connection.[654] It would be unlikely for such a wall to fall or be removed without catastrophic damage to the rest of the foundations and excavators found no evidence of such destruction (cutting or removal) when excavating between walls V and VI (Fig. 4.20-21). It seems clear, therefore, the Capitoline Temple did not have a grid of foundations; rather, as Mura Sommella suggests, there are transverse walls connecting longitudinal walls II and III and IV and V, and as Pietrangeli shows, a transverse wall between walls III and IV (Fig. 4.14).

The foundation and podium of the Capitoline Temple are, at their deepest, 12.75 m tall, the north and south perimeter walls 8 m wide, east and west perimeter walls 6.90 m wide, internal longitudinal walls 4 m wide and podium walls 3.85 m wide. Two independent measurements of the overall dimensions of the foundations, one based on the Capitoline Museums' AutoCAD plan and one based on a compilation of measurements taken of temple foundations themselves have the same outcome: they measure 73.75 m long and 53.50 m wide.[655] The width between walls III and IV is 8.5 m; between walls II and III and walls IV and V, the width is 4.65, and between walls I and II and walls V and VI, the width is 3.10 m (Fig. 4.13).

[654] A. Mura Sommella 2000b, 62-63; A. Danti 2001, 341, fig. 313.
[655] Measurements taken on 28 January 2008 with both a Leica Disto A6 and a tape measure.

Based on these dimensions, the foundations of the Capitoline Temple constitute over 32,000 $m^3$ of tuff masonry.[656] No known foundations of this size exist anywhere in the Italic peninsula at this time, nor would they until architects built the concrete substructures at Palestrina, Tivoli and Terracina in the late-second and first centuries BCE.[657] In Central Italy, the Ara della Regina, phases I and II possess the only contemporaneous foundations that are remotely comparable, but even they remain just half the depth and width of the Capitoline Temple foundations; after the Ara della Regina, the next largest archaic temple foundations occupy just nine percent of the Capitoline Temple's volume.[658] The west and east perimeter foundation walls of the Capitoline are ten rows of masonry wide, and 27 courses deep; Temple A at Pyrgi has the second thickest known perimeter walls at four rows wide, and just eight courses deep (Fig. 4.22).[659] In fact, the foundations of the Capitoline alone are larger than any other known archaic Central Italic building, substructure and superstructure combined. Only two Italic structures challenge the circumference of the foundations: the Upper Building

[656] Two 45.5 x 6.9 x 12.75 m walls, four 45.5 x 4 x 12.75 m walls, two 53.5 x 8 x 12.75 m walls and one 53.5 x 5 x 12.75 m wall, plus all transverse walls and three rear longitudinal walls.

[657] The closest rival would be the fourth century substructure of the Ara della Regina at 31.5 x 62 m. Otherwise, cf. F. Coarelli 1974; J. B. Ward-Perkins 1981; W. L. MacDonald 1982; G. Colonna 1984; F. Sear 1989; A. Boëthius*, et al.* 1994; G. Barker and T. Rasmussen 1998; S. Haynes 2000; M. Torelli 2000; J. W. Stamper 2005; G. Colonna 2006. S. Italic substructures typically are not as large, primarily because bedrock was not so far below ground. On western Greek architecture: D. Mertens and M. Schützenberger 2006.

[658] On the Ara della Regina: M. Bonghi Jovino 1997, 89-91. The foundations of Temple B at Pyrgi (34.47x23.98, six courses deep), Temple II at Satricum (33.9x21.05) and the Colle della Noce temple at Ardea (31x23.35, 4 courses of podium) are the largest in Archaic Central Italy and are all between 18 and 20% the size of the Capitoline. For measurements, see E. Stefani 1954, 8-10; G. Colonna and M. Pallottino 1970, 23; J. A. K. E. De Waele 1981, 29-30.

[659] G. Colonna and M. Pallottino 1970, 23-36, pl. 151.II:117.

at Murlo and the building at Montetosto, near Caere, but these have large empty courtyards (Fig. 4.23).[660] Of structures in Central Italy with similar foundation plans (Temples A and B at Pyrgi, Temples I and II at Satricum, phases I and II of the Ara della Regina and temples at Ardea, Vulci (Fontanile di Legnisina), Veii (Portonaccio), Orvieto, Velletri, Caere, Marzabotto, Pompeii, Rome (Castor), and elsewhere), none approaches the scale of the Capitoline.

**The Capitoline Revetments**

During excavation Mura Sommella's team also discovered revetments that belong to the Capitoline Temple. The ca. 60 cm tall anthemion decoration is the only part of the terracottas that remain (Fig. 4.6, 4.24-5). Scholars suggest a comparison between the style and form of the Capitoline frieze and the frieze of the second temple at Satricum and temple B at Pyrgi.[661] The Satricum frieze measures 59 cm in total height; it has a 26.5 cm tall anthemion relief very similar to the Capitoline's topped with a painted band between two half-rounds and a strigil course above (Fig. 4.26).[662] Its anthemion decoration constitutes 45% of the total height, a common proportional scheme for anthemion revetments in Central Italy.[663] A reconstruction of the Capitoline Temple

[660] J. M. Turfa and A. G. Steinmayer, Jr. 2002, 3-6 with references.
[661] On Pyrgi: A. Mura Sommella 2000a, 24-26; in personal correspondence, Nancy Winter suggests Satricum.
[662] A. Andrén 1940, 474-475.
[663] A. Andrén 1940, 474-475.

frieze based on this type (with a painted band, half-rounds and strigil course) indicates a total height of 1.33 m.

## III. Reconstructing the Capitoline Temple correspondence

### Previous Reconstructions of the Temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus

Working before Lanciani identified its remains, Canina looked to Vitruvian theory and Dionysius' description for his reconstruction of the Capitoline Temple:

> It stood on a high base and was eight hundred feet in circuit, each side measuring close to two hundred feet; indeed one would find the excess of the length over the width to be but slight, in fact not a full fifteen feet. For the temple that was built in the time of our fathers after the burning of this one [the archaic temple] was erected upon the same foundations, and having three rows of columns on the side facing south and single colonnades on the sides, it differed from the ancient structure in nothing but the costliness of the materials. The temple consists of three parallel shrines, separated by party walls; the middle shrine is dedicated to Jupiter while on one side stands that of Juno and on the other that of Minerva, all three being under one pediment and one roof.[664]

Gjerstad and others try to fit Dionysius' description with material remains for their reconstructions; while the two sets of evidence largely correspond, there are a few minor discrepancies.[665] The archaeologically attested 210 x 180 Roman-foot dimensions are close to Dionysius' measurements, but have a 30-foot difference between length and

[664] Dion. IV.61.3-4, after Dionysius 1937 .
[665] E. Gjerstad 1953-1973, III.178-186 Stamper notes some discrepancies: J. W. Stamper 2005, 21-24.

width not the fifteen he specifies.[666] This could be a matter of error on Dionysius part or he could have been measuring around the colonnade, which may have been closer to the 200 x 200 measurements. Still, his measurement is remarkably close to the dimensions of Gjerstad's temple. Jordan justly points out that the temple does not face south, but rather 24 degrees west of south.[667] While the temple was in fact raised on a 4.5 meter-tall podium, not a negligible height, Romans seem to have found it proportionally low compared to surrounding temples.[668] Otherwise, Gjerstad is able to match Dionysius' description with the archaeological evidence to create his plan.

Until recently, the plan in *Early Rome III* remained the most commonly referenced and reproduced (Fig. 4.7).[669] It largely follows Canina's proposal but removes eccentricities like internal colonnades and some pilasters. In Gjerstad's reconstruction the temple has three rows of six columns (tripteral hexastyle) creating a deep porch on the front half of the podium; the front foundation wall (VIII) supports the front row of columns and the longitudinal foundation walls support columns in the second two colonnades. Behind these columns he reconstructs the cella walls on the four internal longitudinal foundations and lateral colonnades flanking the cellas on the outside longitudinal foundations, I and VI; these maintain the interaxial spacing of the porch. A solid wall over the rear foundation wall (VII) has pilasters at its two ends and connects to

---

[666] E. Gjerstad 1953-1973, III.178-179. This does not account for Mura Sommella's adjustment; I will discuss this further below.
[667] H. Jordan 1876, 162.
[668] L. Catulus apparently believed so: Gell.II.10.
[669] E. Gjerstad 1953-1973, III.178-183, fig. 116. It has been reproduced in the following texts: D. S. Robertson 1945, 200; F. Sear 1989; A. Boëthius*, et al.* 1994; P. Gros 1996.

the longitudinal cella walls, closing the rear of the temple. The fronts of the four cella walls are at exactly the half depth of the temple, dividing its length in two.

Following the recent excavations, Mura Sommella published a new plan of the Capitoline Temple, combining her team's findings with the findings that Gjerstad and others had published (Fig. 4.27).[670] She follows the proportions and rough plan that Gjerstad establishes but changes the position of cella doors and reworks the rear of the building. As to the cellas, like Gjerstad, she suggests that their side walls occupied the rear half of the foundations, but argues that the doors to the side cellas are on top of transverse walls and the door to the middle cella on an as yet undiscovered central transverse wall (Fig. 4.14, IX and X, Fig. 4.12 r).[671] In her attempt to incorporate the rear foundations, Mura Sommella looks to the fourth century Ara della Regina, suggesting that the Capitoline Temple had two similar chambers attached to the back of the cellas (Fig. 4.28).[672] She admits that this part of her reconstruction is hypothetical, and in the exhibition in the Capitoline Museums, she omits the addition.[673] Overall her plan (excluding the rear rooms) is not radically different from Gjerstad's and presents no new major tectonic concerns.[674]

[670] A. Mura Sommella 2000a, 21.
[671] A. Mura Sommella 2000b, 62.
[672] A. Mura Sommella 2000b, 62-64.
[673] Exhibition viewed several times between May, 2006 and June, 2009.
[674] Her reconstruction plan does not include the front transverse walls XI-XIII or rear longitudinal walls XVIII-XIX; I address this below.

In response to Gjerstad's plan Castagnoli states that early Romans could not have built a superstructure that would cover the entire platform.[675] Furthermore, he suggests that Gjerstad's application of Vitruvian principles in his reconstruction of the temple is unwise, as the temple's exceptional description and scale do not fit Vitruvian ideals.[676] Instead, Castagnoli suggests that the temple occupied only part of the podium and furthermore, that it was not a *peripteros sine postico* as Gjerstad suggests.[677] Giuliani and others follow Castagnoli, adding that wooden columns would have buckled under the pressure of the terracotta roof that capped the building, and wooden lintels would have split under the weight of a ridgepole pillar over an implausibly wide, unsupported central span; furthermore, Giuliani states that there was not enough evidence for the internal foundations to suggest how the central part of the building may have looked.[678] Castagnoli and Giuliani wrote these arguments before the new excavations revealed all four internal foundation walls.

In reaction to Mura Sommella's reconstruction, John Stamper suggested a new plan for the temple, reawakening a fundamental argument over the image of the building:

---

[675] F. Castagnoli 1955; F. Castagnoli 1966-1967, 73-74; F. Castagnoli 1974, 435; C. F. Giuliani 1982, 31; F. Castagnoli 1984, 3-20.

[676] Cifani states that Riemann first argued this point in 1969, but Castagnoli had already suggested a small temple of different plan and had considered the 'peripteros sine postico': F. Castagnoli 1955, 139-145; F. Castagnoli 1966-1967, 14.

[677] F. Castagnoli 1955, 139-145; F. Castagnoli 1966-1967, 14; F. Castagnoli 1973-1974, 123-131; F. Castagnoli 1984, 3-20. Ganzert and Damgaard Andersen have since suggested that Castagnoli's modern term 'peripteros sine postico' should not be used as there was no ancient theory or nomenclature for a building of this type. Rather, they suggest this is just a temple with colonnade on three sides: J. Ganzert 1990, 107-114; H. Damgaard Andersen 1998, 198.

[678] C. F. Giuliani 1982, 31 cf. R. Mambella 1982, 35-42 and below on others who have taken this argument.

was it colossal?[679] He reasserts Giuliani and Castagnoli's arguments, stating that Mura Sommella's plan does not account for the tectonic problems presented by wooden columns and a post and lintel roof.[680] To these he adds three new arguments against the reconstruction of a colossal temple. First, he doubts that archaic Romans could build a temple larger "than the much more famous Parthenon in Athens."[681] Also, he points out that a discrepancy between Mura Sommella's new plan and Dionysius' dimensions demands a reanalysis of the ancient author's description.[682] Lastly, he believes Mura Sommella's excavations uncovered a massive platform of cappellaccio blocks underneath the entirety of the Palazzo Caffarelli instead of the rows of foundation walls that she records.[683] Based on these arguments, he reconstructs a small hexastyle temple (40 x 34 m) on a massive platform and suggests this is the only way to imagine the archaic Capitoline.[684]

Giuliani and Stamper claim that wooden columns and walls could not support a terracotta roof; yet Gjerstad long ago proposed the Capitoline Temple's columns and walls were built of stone, not wood; few have since questioned his argument.[685] Gjerstad's claim is convincing for two reasons. Archaeological evidence for the temple's

[679] J. W. Stamper 2005, 21-27; P. L. Tucci 2006, 386-390.
[680] J. W. Stamper 2005, 27.
[681] J. W. Stamper 2005, 24.
[682] J. W. Stamper 2005, 21-27.
[683] J. W. Stamper 2005, 27, fig. 15.
[684] J. W. Stamper 2005, 21-27.
[685] C. F. Giuliani 1982, 31; J. W. Stamper 2005, 27. Cf. R. Mambella 1982, 35-42. Contra: E. Gjerstad 1953-1973, III.185; G. Colonna 1987a, 65.

stone foundations is clear, and if Romans could quarry, transport and erect 12 m tall, 8 m wide substructure walls totaling 32,000 $m^3$ of stone, there is no reason to believe they could not do the same for the superstructure (see fig. 4.22).[686] Furthermore, stone columns and walls exist from temples and houses at Rome, Pyrgi, Lanuvium, Satricum, Roselle, Acquarossa and other sites throughout archaic Central Italy.[687] Romans quarried and utilized enormous quantities of stone, and evidence demonstrates they did so throughout Rome in buildings like the Temple of Castor, the Comitium, the Regia and even for modest structures like those along the north slope of the Palatine.[688] A stone superstructure *could* withstand the weight of a terracotta roof.

Still, Stamper and Giuliani argue that regardless of superstructure materials, the temple would have a twelve-meter central intercolumniation, and no post and lintel roof could bridge such a distance.[689] Yet their calculation for the span is misleading. Since the Capitoline Temple's superstructure does not exist, archaeologists at Rome record the span as the distance between the midpoints of foundation walls. Scholars calculating

[686] Two 45.5 x 6.9 x 12.75 m walls, four 45.5 x 4 x 12.75 m walls, two 53.5 x 8 x 12.75 m walls and one 53.5 x 5 x 12.75 m wall, plus all transverse walls and three rear longitudinal walls.

[687] For a survey of stone walls and columns in Central Italy: H. Damgaard Andersen 1998, 93-96. On specific sites: Pyrgi – G. Colonna 1966, 268-277; G. Colonna and M. Pallottino 1970, 43; Marzabotto – H. Damgaard Andersen 1998, 93; Satricum – J. A. K. E. De Waele 1981, 31; Pompeii – J. A. K. E. De Waele and R. Cantilena 2001, 113; Veii (Portonaccio) – E. Stefani 1953, 43; Rome, (Castor) – I. Nielsen and J. Zahle 1985, 78; Lanuvium – A. Galieti 1928, 93-94; Tarquinia – M. Bonghi Jovino 1997, 89-90. For Western Greek stone architecture in the Archaic period, the bibliography is vast; recently: D. Mertens and M. Schützenberger 2006.

[688] On Castor, the Comitium and Regia, see Chapter 1. On the n. slope of the Palatine, A. Carandini*, et al.* 1995 [2000].

[689] C. F. Giuliani 1982, 31; J. W. Stamper 2005, 24.

Greek and Imperial Roman roof spans, which Stamper uses as comparanda, depend on the distance between the internal faces of walls and columns in the superstructure: thus a span of 11.05 m in the Parthenon or 21.71 m in the Temple of Apollo at Didyma is taken as wall-to-wall, column-to-column measurement not an inter-axial calculation (Fig. 4.29).[690] If one suggests a wall-to-wall measure for the Capitoline, its span decreases. Comparison with other colossal buildings in Central Italy suggest the Capitoline's walls would be between 1.5 and two meters thick; cautiously assuming 1.5-m walls the central span is just 10.5 m (Figs. 4.27, 4.30).[691] Furthermore, post-and-lintel roofing was not the only option available to archaic Romans, and comparison with temples in central and south Italy and Sicily indicates a 10.5 m span is not only conceivable with wooden trabeation, it was achieved often before the Capitoline.

The closest comparanda for such a span are at Tarquinia, the Ara della Regina phases I and II, and at Murlo, the Upper Building (Fig. 4.31). At Murlo, the span is just over 8 m in the rooms without internal colonnades; archaeologists reconstruct pitched roofs with terracotta revetments above these spaces.[692] Turfa and Steinmayer, like Stamper, argue that a post and lintel system could not support a roof of this large a span and this heavy a load.[693] The problem here, however, arises not because a lintel would

[690] T. Hodge 1960, 39.
[691] J. M. Turfa and A. G. Steinmayer, Jr. 1996, 4-5, 8-13; G. Cifani 2008, 105, 109.
[692] J. M. Turfa and A. G. Steinmayer, Jr. 1996, 22. Turfa and Steinmayer propose a 12 m truss at Murlo, and while it may have existed, excavations of post holes suggest that the 12 m span of the north side was supported with a central colonnade. Here I apply their analysis to the 9 m spans of the south, west and east sides.
[693] J. M. Turfa and A. G. Steinmayer, Jr. 1996, 4, 22. Stamper argues that any span over 7.5 m was too large for post and lintel, thus would be the 8-9 m spans at Murlo.

snap under the vertical thrust of the roof's weight, but because the pisé walls could not withstand a heavy terracotta roof's lateral thrust.[694] As excavators found terracottas for a pitched roof over these rooms, architects must have found a way to roof the space between the walls, and Turfa and Steinmayer argue they could only have achieved this with a tie-beam truss (Fig. 4.32).[695] A truss, or isosceles triangle of beams structurally conjoined at the lower corners, could support a far heavier load of purlins, rafters and tiles. As a single unit, a truss transforms lateral thrust into vertical thrust, and so, the pisé walls would not experience significant strain or collapse. In the Upper Building, scholars believe it was used with confidence, given the weight of terracottas, the length of the span and the relative weakness of the walls, and so, they suggest by ca. 575 when the Upper building was finished, the truss must have been well understood.[696] Murlo provides a precedent for a trussed roof in Central Italy, but not on a span like the Capitoline's 10.5 meters. Architects in Rome had a larger space to cross and more weight to bear; they were dealing with a stone wall which required a different set of calculations and so, while the problem (supporting a heavy roof over a wide space) was similar, the path to a solution may have been different.[697]

At Tarquinia architects met precisely the same tectonic issues present at Rome. They had a 9.5 m span to cross and a stone walled structure to roof with heavy

[694] J. M. Turfa and A. G. Steinmayer, Jr. 1996, 4-5, 8-13.
[695] J. M. Turfa and A. G. Steinmayer, Jr. 1996, 22.
[696] J. M. Turfa and A. G. Steinmayer, Jr. 1996, 22, n. 34 with references.
[697] J. M. Turfa and A. G. Steinmayer, Jr. 1996, 5-8.

terracottas.[698] The stone wall would have been able to withstand more lateral thrust and compression than the pisé walls at Murlo, but the larger 9.5 m span is far too wide for wooden post and lintel trabeation; vertical thrust from the ridgepole onto the lintel over the central cella and columned porch would have snapped them (Fig. 4.32-4.33).[699] Furthermore, with no significant weight over rafters to increase their vertical thrust onto walls, the lateral thrust of the heavy terracotta roof would have toppled the temple's cella and alae walls and columns. Still, the terracottas exist, the walls were 9.5 m apart and there are no foundations for internal colonnades to support a roof; the space was spanned, and so, architects must have found some way to roof the cella. The only way to accomplish this would be with a truss, and the contemporaneous use of one at Murlo suggests its availability. It seems likely, therefore, that architects roofing the Ara della Regina at Tarquinia after ca. 575 used a truss to span the cella. Capitoline builders may have looked to Tarquinia as a model for the roof; yet the rest of the Roman temple (its foundations and several aspects of its superstructure) suggests they were also looking to Greek architecture, and an examination of Greek trusses may be fruitful.[700]

Many ten-plus meter spans were roofed in Sicily and Greece at the end of the archaic period. Temples with cellas and colonnades spanning spaces like the Capitoline

---

[698] The interaxial measure of the cella's foundation walls is 11 m; a 1 to 1.5-meter thick superstructure wall is likely, creating a 9.5 m span. Measurements taken from plan of site and by author at the site. On the terracottas, see M. Bonghi Jovino 1997, 69-95; N. A. Winter 2006a, 127-144.

[699] Cf. T. Hodge 1960, 17-40; J. M. Turfa and A. G. Steinmayer, Jr. 1996, 1-20.

[700] One the superstructure's ties to Greek architecture: W. Alzinger 1982, 24-26; M. Rendeli 1989, 49; D. Mertens 1994, 195-200; J. M. Turfa and A. G. Steinmayer, Jr. 2002, 6; and this chapter, below.

Temple include Temple E at Selinunte (11.70 m), the Temple of Herakles at Agrigento (11.84 m), the Olympieion at Agrigento (12.85 m) and the Temple of Demeter at S. Biagio (10.35 m); other temples with spans approaching 10.5 m include the Temple of Athena at Syracuse and the Treasury of Gela.[701] The Temple of Athena at Syracuse, the three temples at Agrigento and the Treasury of Gela at Olympia were all begun at the same time as the Capitoline or just after it, indicating the capacity to roof large spans was pervading the western Mediterranean.[702]

Trevor Hodge first outlined an argument that architects at these sites must have used trusses.[703] He argues in detail about the Megaron of Demeter at Gaggera and the Treasury of Gela at Olympia (both ca. 600-550).[704] In these buildings, purlins (wooden beams running the length of a roof) far outnumber columns (Fig. 4.34). Builders must have found a way to carry these purlins throughout their length, but a post-and-lintel roof could not provide the necessary support. In such a roofing system columns support pillars on the lintel; these pillars in turn support purlins. Without columns under pillars for the thirteen purlins at Gaggera, the unsupported central portion of the lintel would carry all the weight of the purlins and roof; under such strain, the beam would crack. Hodge suggests that the only way to account for the excess purlins is that these buildings had trusses; the triangular frame of a truss could support any number of purlins. He

[701] T. Hodge 1960, 29, Table I. This list does not include Temple G, because it seems the space was never ment to be roofed. Also, The Olympieion seems not to have been finished, but there is evidence that architects had planned on roofing it.
[702] D. Mertens and M. Schützenberger 2006, 111-112, 235-237, 239, 261-266.
[703] T. Hodge 1960, 17-42.
[704] T. Hodge 1960, 17-24.

argues, therefore, that architects built several trusses, mounted these on columns and laid purlins across them. This created the framework of early archaic roofs in Sicily. The roof that Hodge analyses at Gaggera did not cover a wide span, and Hodge does not argue the truss was developed for this purpose. Rather, he suggests Sicilian Greeks developed a truss because they found it easier to build thin triangular frames supporting small purlins than to fell the thick trees for massive beams and struts that post and lintel roofs require.[705] Nancy Klein has applied Hodge's analysis of the Demeter sanctuary to other temples in the Greek world and discovered the Greek mainland has no similar roofs except in treasuries for Sicilian or Western Greek poleis.[706] On the other hand, several temples in the west seem to have similar roofing systems. The temple with spiral acroteria, Temple C and perhaps Temple Y at Selinunte all date to ca. 550 and demonstrate the same signs that the Gaggera roof exhibits; the Temple of Vulcan at Agrigento which dates ca. 560-550 and the Temple of Artemis at Corfu, which dates ca. 580-560 also show signs of a "Gaggera," or trussed, roof.[707] In these early structures the truss does not support an exceptional span; rather, it seems that architects in western Greece simply preferred this means of trabeation. The multitude of truss-roofed buildings constructed in Sicily and the West between 600 and 550 suggests that the Gaggera roof is not new at this time. As in Central Italy, some kind of gestation would have occurred in the late seventh century and by the early sixth century, architects were comfortable enough to apply it to a large number of monumental projects. Hodge and

[705] T. Hodge 1960, 22.
[706] N. L. Klein 1998, 369.
[707] N. L. Klein 1998, 351.

Klein's analyses demonstrate that Western Greeks used the truss to span cellas and colonnades as wide as 8.5 m by the middle of the sixth century, when architects in Central Italy were doing the same. By the late sixth century, Sicilian architects were spanning cellas as wide as 11.84 m, over a meter more than central cella of the contemporaneous Capitoline Temple.

Architects could easily have spanned the 10.5-m central intercolumniation of the Capitoline Temple with a truss.[708] What is more, since that roofing system was widely tested and used by the late sixth century, architects building at Rome would have known they could achieve this.

Stamper looks to the fame of the Parthenon to discredit suggestions that Romans could eclipse the great Athenian building before its time, but the Parthenon is, in fact, a small building in comparison with many earlier temples. Colossal archaic temples at Ephesus, Didyma, Samos, Agrigento, Selinunte and in Athens itself date immediately before the Capitoline Temple or contemporaneously with it; the wherewithal to build massive temples out of stone existed in the Mediterranean long before the Parthenon (Fig. 4.35).[709] Furthermore, the remains of the enormous stone foundations on the Capitoline indicate Romans not only could, but *did* build on a colossal scale.[710]

---

[708] At St. Peters, a single tie-beam truss spanned 24 meters: J. P. Adam 1984, 212.
[709] On the dimensions of the Parthenon: A. W. Lawrence and R. A. Tomlinson 1983, 195; on the dimensions of the other temples: W. B. Dinsmoor 1975, 99, 101, 124, 127, 134; A. W. Lawrence and R. A. Tomlinson 1983, 146.
[710] Cf. W. Alzinger 1982, 24-26; M. Rendeli 1989, 49; D. Mertens 1994, 203; P. J. E. Davies 2006, 187-190.

Based on the above arguments Stamper confronts Mura Sommella's addition of 12 m to the rear of the temple platform; he again follows Castagnoli and others, arguing that scholars have misunderstood Dionysius.[711] Stamper uses Earnest Cary's translation of Dionysius, which states: "It [the temple] stood upon a high base and was eight hundred feet in circuit, each side measuring close to two hundred feet…"[712] Stamper argues that the 800-foot circuit and the two-hundred foot sides refer to the temple's "high base;" the *aedes*, he believes, could have been smaller (Fig. 4.36). Yet in Dionysius *oktaplethros*, or eight hundred, could refer either to *krepis*, which is feminine or to the masculine subject of the verb *epoiethe*, namely, *naos*.[713] So, the measurements Dionysius gives do not necessarily refer to the temple's base and could provide the circuit for the superstructure.[714]

So far I have argued that the Capitoline temple *could* have been colossal; archaic Roman architects had at their fingertips the tectonic skill to build the structure that Gjerstad and Mura Sommella suggest, and archaeology and ancient literature point to a colossal building. It remains to establish that Romans not only could build a colossal temple, but that they did.

---

[711] J. W. Stamper 2005, 24, and on Castagnoli and others arguing for the platform, see above.
[712] Dionysius 1937, IV.61.63.
[713] Dion. IV.61.3 .
[714] There are many reasons why Dionysius' measurement might not match the full size of the foundations and the original building: perhaps the rear rooms were not considered part of the temple proper, or perhaps religious custom had changed enough since the Archaic period that they were not rebuilt in the first century at all.

The revetments of the Capitoline Temple are colossal—abnormally large in comparison to other similar Central Italic revetments—and their size strongly suggests they belong to a temple that occupied the entire surface of the existing substructures. Remains indicate an anthemion frieze 60 cm tall.[715] At 37 cm tall, anthemion reliefs from Pyrgi are the closest rivals; all other stylistically and formally similar anthemion decoration, including examples from Cività Castellana, Satricum and Segni measure between 17 and 26 cm tall.[716] The Capitoline anthemion decoration is exceptional, dramatically larger than its contemporaries, suggesting a temple of colossal size.

If the revetments seem too big for a diminutive reconstruction, hinting that the temple was colossal, the foundations offer an even clearer picture of the temple's colossal size. In keeping with his architectural training, Stamper recognizes a problem for those who reconstruct the Capitoline as a small temple. Such a building would have a slimmer façade, shorter intercolumniations and narrower cellas; it would not correspond to the plan of foundation walls that Mura Sommella records (Fig. 4.37). Recognizing the structural problems of fitting the walls of this temple partially on stone foundations and partially over unstable earthen fill, Stamper proposes that Mura Sommella's excavations produced evidence for a platform of foundations; thus, he draws an uninterrupted mass of stone underneath the L-shaped Palazzo Caffarelli (Fig. 4.38).[717] Yet the stones he

[715] A. Mura Sommella 2000a, 24-26.
[716] A. Andrén 1940; G. Colonna 1985, 129-134.
[717] J. W. Stamper 2005, 27, fig. 15. His reconstruction places the temple on a double platform: the foundation platform supports a smaller central platform on top of which is the

draws in his plan of foundations do not correspond to excavated materials; Mura Sommella's reports and remains still visible in the Palazzo Caffarelli indicate that no foundation platform ever existed.[718] Six deep cores and excavations in eight large areas between the longitudinal foundation walls found no trace of a platform (Fig. 4.19).[719] Given the analogous widths of internal longitudinal walls and the fact that *not one* header protrudes from the face of any of the exposed walls, it seems clear that where visible, one sees the original sides of walls (Fig. 4.39-4.41). Were the current faces of walls the result of an intervention into an original platform of uninterrupted foundations, one would expect to find either headers cut short to make the sides of walls flush or headers protruding from the wall. None is present, and a comparison of segments of ruined walls with undamaged wall faces further highlights the integrity of the longitudinal walls (Fig. 4.42-4.43). The foundations constitute longitudinal and transverse walls, *not* a platform. Thus, many of Stamper's walls and colonnades would have disparate substructures; with the weight of a terracotta roof pressing down on the entire superstructure, the dissimilar material below would offer uneven support and prove disastrous.

---

Capitoline Temple. The smaller platform does not serve as a foundation, but rather just to elevate the temple; structurally speaking, if the center of this platform is built over fill, the center of the temple is still *founded* on fill. The temple's internal columns and walls would press on the platform, which would in turn press into the soil.

[718] Archaeologists have long agreed on the walls; Stamper is the only to question them. Cf. G. Tagliamonte 1996, 145 with references; P. L. Tucci 2006, 390.

[719] A. Mura Sommella 2000a, 7-26; A. Mura Sommella 2000b, 57-79; A. Danti 2001, 323-328; A. Mura Sommella 2001, 262-264; A. Mura Sommella 2002, 303-323. Remains viewed in January 2008.

The Capitoline Temple foundations provide two more reasons why the superstructure would have occupied their entire surface. Jordan's 1885 study of the temple determined that the top of foundations and hill were equal in elevation (Fig. 4.44).[720] Alvarez and others' recent geological and archaeological studies corroborate Jordan's findings; they state that after millennia of substantial erosion, the top of the Capitoline Hill in the area of the temple is approximately 43-45 masl, and the foundation walls reach 45 masl.[721] That is to say, the 32,000 $m^3$ of foundations reaching eight meters into the hill are almost entirely embedded today and certainly would have been 2500 years ago; the only part of the foundation that is currently significantly above the hill's soil is the extreme-northwest corner, but erosion has probably struck hardest at the slopes (Fig. 4.45).[722] Even permitting that this corner rose above the hill in antiquity, 95% of the foundations remain entrenched. In temples throughout the archaic Mediterranean, from North Italy to North Africa, and from Sicily to Ionia, builders sunk foundations into the earth to support heavy superstructures. What is striking is that in each of these temples, the dimensions of the foundations precisely match the dimensions of the superstructure; a survey of over 50 sites presents no example of an archaic Italic or Greek temple that does not occupy the entire surface of its foundations.[723] It seems

[720] H. Jordan 1885, Tafel II S.66 ff.
[721] W. Alvarez*, et al.* 1996, 752-753; A. Danti 2001, 342.
[722] On the changing geomorphology of the Capitoline: W. Alvarez*, et al.* 1996, 751-752; A. J. Ammerman and N. Terrenato 1996, 35-46; cf. A. M. Colini 1965, 175-185.
[723] E. Brizio 1889, 258-260; L. Pernier 1926, 164; A. Galieti 1928, 75-94; E. Stefani 1944, 231; E. Stefani 1953, 35-43; E. Stefani 1954, 7-12; G. Colonna and M. Pallottino 1970, 23-43, 275-287; J. A. K. E. De Waele 1981, 19-41; G. Colonna 1981b, 51-59; J. Beaufort*, et al.* 1982; G. Pisani Sartorio 1982, 51-56; G. Colonna 1984, 396-411; P. Chiarucci and T. Gizi

unlikely that the Capitoline Temple was the only exception to this rule, and so, by comparison with its contemporaries it would have covered its foundations. What is more, a reconstruction that does not occupy the entire substructure implies that architects sunk nearly 20,000 $m^3$ of foundation around a small temple in order to reinforce pavement (Fig. 4.46).[724] One might expect deep foundations for a terrace built off the side of a hill, such as one finds at the Ara della Regina or more commonly in the Hellenistic period, but the Capitoline foundations do not reinforce or create a terrace.

To summarize, the existing foundations of the Capitoline Temple seem to have supported a temple of equal size; the amount of labor that went into building such massive substructures would be unimaginable if they were not to be used. The temple

---

1985, 47; G. Colonna 1985, 53-65, 67-78, 80-83, 88-92, 98-101, 127-134; B. Massabò 1988-1989, 108-125; Il viver quotidiano in Roma arcaica: materiali degli scavi del Tempio Arcaico nell'area sacra di S. Omobono 1989, 13-36; I. Nielsen and B. Poulsen 1992, 78-79; A. Boëthius*, et al.* 1994; M. Bonghi Jovino 1997, 87-89; H. Damgaard Andersen 1998, esp. 87-95 and diagrams; J. A. K. E. De Waele and R. Cantilena 2001, 88-92; G. Colonna 2006, 132-168. The Ara della Regina, Phase I might seem an exception; its substructures, however, serve both to support the superstructure and to extend the hillside, perching the temple off a precipice. The substructure therefore has two functions. This would become popular in the Hellenistic period, but the second function distinguishes the Tarquinian foundations from the Capitoline. See M. Bonghi Jovino 1997, 87-89. For Greek Temples: W. B. Dinsmoor 1975, 69-113,123-146; A. W. Lawrence and R. A. Tomlinson 1983, 141-159, 160-173. On specific buildings and on building practices: F. H. Bacon*, et al.* 1902, 141; P. Orsi 1903, 374-376; D. G. Hogarth*, et al.* 1908, pl.12; E. Buschor 1930, 72; F. Courby 1931, pl.II, III; H. N. Fowler*, et al.* 1932, pl. I, V; P. Orsi 1933, 23-26, fig. 23; G. Rodenwaldt 1939, Tafel 3, 22; G. Gruben 1963, 78-89; J. Feye 1970, 88-99; D. Adamesteanu*, et al.* 1975, 109; A. De Franciscis 1979, fig. 6; J. M. Camp and W. B. Dinsmoor 1984, 11; V. Lambrinoudakis and G. Gruben 1987, abb.13; D. Mertens*, et al.* 1993, 5-15, Tafel 14-17, 20; J. De La Geniere*, et al.* 1997, 337, 344; J. M. Cook and R. V. Nicholls 1998, 109-176; J. De La Geniere*, et al.* 1999, 501-502, 505, 507; J. A. K. E. De Waele and R. Cantilena 2001, 88-92; F. A. Cooper 2008, 229-234.

[724] see above, note 630. Stamper, Castagnoli and Giuliani's reconstructions do not cover the perimeter or rear walls, whose dimensions total approximately 20,000 $m^3$. C. F. Giuliani 1982, 31; F. Castagnoli 1984, 3-20; J. W. Stamper 2005, 390; P. L. Tucci 2006, 390.

would have had stone columns and walls, and Central Italic and western Greek architects not only could, but often *did* span 10-plus meters with wood trabeation. One should dismiss the belief that archaic Romans could not build monumental structures; without question, they did: the Capitoline foundations alone are larger than any Central Italic building and among the most colossal structures built in the archaic Mediterranean. The plan of the foundations could not support Stamper or others' small hexastyle temple: a temple founded partly on solid stone and partly on earthen fill would be structurally unsound. Furthermore, the size of the temple's revetments in comparison with revetments of contemporaneous temples suggests a building of enormous size. Perhaps most convincingly, archaic temples in the Mediterranean consistently occupy all of their foundations. A temple of this size in Rome during the archaic period dramatically alters the history and urban image of early Rome and the history of Roman architecture. It remains to reexamine reconstructions of the temple in light of recent finds.

**Refining the reconstruction**

Gjerstad hypothesized much about the temple that Mura Sommella's excavations have refined and clarified. In her reconstruction, the front half of the temple is composed of a forest of 18 columns comprising a tripteral hexastyle porch. Behind the porch, lateral colonnades flank a triple cella with staggered thresholds that align with lateral columns. Her reconstruction is a cogent arrangement of archaeological and literary evidence and accounts for the temple's meticulous design. Outside of her and Gjerstad's

application of Dionysius' description to the foundations, several other arguments lead to a reconstruction of the temple that is similar to hers. Scholars tend to agree that the temple had a triple cella from the start: it was well known for that historical design when Dionysius was writing and capitolia in the mid to late Republic emulate this plan long before the Capitoline's first century reconstruction.[725] What is more, extensive analysis of archaic Mediterranean temples (Central Italic and Greek) indicates that architects consistently built substructures only to support walls and colonnades.[726] That is to say, a foundation wall should correspond to a wall or colonnade in the superstructure. If scholars agree that the temple had a triple cella, the only logical location for it on these foundations are the four internal longitudinal walls. The rest of the reconstruction, with colonnades on three sides, is largely bound to Dionysius' description, but this need not be as tenuous a line of reasoning as some scholars think. To begin with, Dionysius is not reaching through time to a lost building of the sixth century, but rather, to one that had existed just a generation before him. Also, though some may be reticent to give Dionysius credit, recent excavations have proven several of his statements to be correct: remains indicate the temple was not only archaic in date and enormous, just as he suggests, but also extraordinarily close to the dimensions he provides.[727] Also, he remarks that all reconstructions used the original foundations, changing nothing of the superstructure's plan; excavations uncovered imperial concrete buttresses reinforcing

[725] No reconstruction of the temple omits the triple cella.
[726] See below, note 705.
[727] G. Cifani 2008, 101. In a recent talk, Mura Sommella even presents a way to explain the discrepancy between Dionysius' measurement and the rear foundations, suggesting his 200x200 ft measure was around the colonnade, not the podium: A. Mura Sommella 2008.

segments of the archaic foundations, but found no changes to their plan, again supporting Dionysius' account.[728] The repeated corroboration of Dionysius in the material record suggests his description should stand.[729] With this in mind, it is difficult to reconstruct a temple to the Capitoline triad on these foundations that does not have three cellas flanked by colonnades with a triple colonnaded porch. A look at proportional schemes present in the foundations may help clarify the location and number of colonnades in the superstructure. The inter-axial distance between the second and fourth longitudinal foundation is nine meters. A measurement from the midpoints of the transverse foundation walls yields a length of exactly double that. Applied to the superstructure these proportions may dictate the position of columns, cella walls and doors that align precisely with the foundations (Fig. 4.47). The results of such an analysis and the precise placement of walls and columns is, of course, hypothetical. In the end, a reconstruction close to Mura Sommella's provides the most lucid explanation of textual, archaeological and comparative evidence for the archaic Capitoline Temple. A few minor discrepancies between archaeological remains and her reconstruction may, however, suggest some adjustments to her plan. The principle concerns regard the front transverse foundation walls, the location of the central cella door and the rear foundations.

[728] A. Mura Sommella 2008; cf. A. Mura Sommella 2000a, 7-26; A. Mura Sommella 2000b, 57-79; A. Danti 2001, 323-328; A. Mura Sommella 2001, 262-264; A. Mura Sommella 2002, 303-323.

[729] Scholars are quick to point out that Dionysius does not mention the rear rooms of the building. For more on this, see below.

Mura Sommella does not mention transverse walls XI, XII and XIV in her reconstruction, and they do not appear to be necessary support for anything in the superstructure.[730] Though at first this may suggest a reanalysis of her plan, a look at contemporaneous foundations suggests that her reconstruction remains valid.

As discussed above, a survey of the remains of archaic temple foundations and superstructures throughout the Mediterranean demonstrates that a foundation wall corresponds to a superstructure wall, a colonnade or a threshold.[731] Colonnades do not necessarily have foundation walls, but if they do, that wall runs below the entire

[730] Mura Sommella, Danti and Cifani all ignore this wall as it relates to the superstructure.
[731] With Italic temples, distinguishing support for walls and colonnades is difficult; still, the existence of one of the two is usually conclusive based on analyses of foundations and terracottas. On general reconstructions:G. Colonna 1984, 396-411; G. Colonna 1985, 53-65, 67-78, 80-83, 88-92, 98-101, 127-134; H. Damgaard Andersen 1998; G. Colonna 2006. For individual sites where it is possible to hypothesize a basic superstructure plan: Marzabotto (Temples b, c, d, "Tinia" Temple) – E. Brizio 1889, 258-260 Pl. I-X; Gabii – G. Colonna 1981b, 51-59; Pyrgi (Temples A and B) – G. Colonna 1965, 191-219; G. Colonna and M. Pallottino 1970, 36-43, 275-287; Satricum (Temples I and II) – J. A. K. E. De Waele 1981, 7-68; P. Chiarucci and T. Gizi 1985, 47-53; Pompeii (Doric temple) – J. A. K. E. De Waele and R. Cantilena 2001, 88-113; Vulci B. Massabò 1988-1989, 103-135; Rome (Castor) – I. Nielsen and J. Zahle 1985, 61-79, esp. 76; Orvieto – L. Pernier 1926, 137-164; Ardea – E. Stefani 1954, 6-30; Veii (Piazza d'Armi) – E. Stefani 1944, 178-290. On archaic Greek temples: western Greek temples in general – D. Mertens and M. Schützenberger 2006, 97-155, 216-309; Archaic temples in general – W. B. Dinsmoor 1975, 69-113, 123-146; A. W. Lawrence and R. A. Tomlinson 1983, 141-159, 160-173. On the correlation between foundations and superstructures in Greek architecture, e.g. J. M. Cook and R. V. Nicholls 1998, 11-12 and recently, F. A. Cooper 2008, 230-234 On specific sites, e.g. Metapontum – D. Adamesteanu*, et al.* 1975, esp. 109; Assos – F. H. Bacon*, et al.* 1902, 141, plate 141; Samos – E. Buschor 1930, 1-162, esp. 172; Temple of Apollo at Delos – F. Courby 1931, pl. II, III; Locri – A. De Franciscis 1979, 49-100, figs. 105-134; Paestum (Foce del Sele) – J. De La Geniere*, et al.* 1997, 337-344; J. De La Geniere*, et al.* 1999, 501-507; Corinth – H. N. Fowler*, et al.* 1932, pl. I, V; Didyma – G. Gruben 1963, esp. 78-85; Ephesus – D. G. Hogarth*, et al.* 1908, pl. I, XII Naxos – V. Lambrinoudakis and G. Gruben 1987, 569-621 abb. 513; Paestum (Hera I) – D. Mertens*, et al.* 1993, 5-15, Tafel 14-17, 20; Syracuse (Olympieion) – P. Orsi 1903, 369-391; Apollo Alaei – P. Orsi 1933, 22-27, figs. 23-24; Corfu – G. Rodenwaldt 1939, Tafel 3, 22.

colonnade, not just one or two intercolumniations. An application of these principles to the foundations of the Capitoline Temple highlights the peculiarity of the front transverse wall (XI-XII-XIV). With the exception of this wall, foundations correspond to a superstructure element. Furthermore, while the transverse wall does correspond to the third transverse colonnade of the porch, it does not support its entire length. There is only one set of foundations in the archaic Mediterranean that shares this idiosyncrasy: The Temple of Hera at Samos (Fig. 4.48).[732] In the archaic tripteral temple there, builders laid longitudinal foundations for the double side colonnades and widely spaced longitudinal foundations for naos walls. They built transverse walls only under the threshold to the naos, under the back wall of the naos and for the front and rear colonnades of the temple. All of these foundations correspond to foundations in the Capitoline Temple. Builders at Samos also laid a transverse foundation wall linking the internal portion of the third frontal colonnade. This foundation did not connect to the outside-most longitudinal foundations and is *only* present for the third row of columns. In the Temple of Hera at Samos, the wall is twice used; since the temple was peripteral, it is used for the third row of columns at both front and back. In the Roman frontal temple, the transverse foundation wall appears only once, due to the prostyle design of the Capitoline Temple. It is unlikely that the Temple of Hera at Samos is the only other place that archaic Mediterranean architects used this partial colonnade-foundation, but its

[732] E. Buschor 1930, 1-162, esp. 172. Here architects may have been overengineering a huge building in a swamp, but architects transferring a similar plan may have transferred the practice without considering the function.

use for the same row of columns in the Samian temple, one of few temples with a triple colonnaded porch, is important for discussions of influence on the Roman building.[733]

Mura Sommella's proposal for the doorway to the central cella is harder to reconcile with the remaining foundations. While a foundation wall may exist where Mura Sommella posits, this cannot be certain. Archaeologists reconstruct temples at Pyrgi (B), Caere and elsewhere in Central Italy without thresholds. One can therefore imagine several arrangements for the Capitoline's cella doors (Fig. 4.49).

The greatest attacks on Mura Sommella's reconstruction concern the rear portion of the temple. She argues a structural bond between Hackens' back wall and the frontal foundations and reconstructs a unified superstructure measuring 54 x 74m; the rear foundations of the temple, she suggests, supported a *posticum*. Cifani presents several claims against Mura Sommella's hypothesis. First, he suggests that a pozzo at the east end of wall VII may be a well to collect rainwater falling from the corner of a roof (Fig. 4.16, 4.50).[734] Archaeologists have argued the same function for pozzi at the front of Temple A at Pyrgi.[735] In this case, the roof that covered the front portion of the temple could not extend over the rear foundations or any structure they supported. Cifani also stresses that each facet of Dionysius' description is remarkably accurate, and that his dimensions do not allow for the posticum.[736] Dionysius' dimensions are in fact difficult to reconcile with a reconstruction of the temple that extends over the rear of the

[733] See below, "IV: The Monumentality of the Temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus."
[734] G. Cifani 2008, 101.
[735] G. Colonna and M. Pallottino 1970, 13-20. Cf. G. Cifani 2008, 101.
[736] G. Cifani 2008, 101.

foundations.[737] The rooms Mura Sommella reconstructs, however, need not be part of the temple proper; if they had a religiously distinct function or were architecturally separated, perhaps by a different roofing system, Dionysius may have chosen not to include them in his description. The rooms would be part of the *templum* and *area capitolina*, but not the temple proper. Or perhaps the rear rooms were not reconstructed after the area burned; perhaps the temple's function or the practices that the rear rooms served did not persist into the late Republic. There are many reasons to account for their absence in Dionysius description, but it is hard to deny the presence of the foundations or their implied superstructure.

If the foundations constituted a solid platform perched off the edge of the hill, one might suggest they just created a terrace at the rear of the structure; instead, they comprise intersecting walls surrounding earthen fill, all embedded in the hill. These do not resemble terracing structures such as one finds in Rome at S. Omobono at the front of the fifth century platform or at Tarquinia at the front of the Ara della Regina.[738] In these sanctuaries, the platforms are solid stone built to extend a terrace in front of the temple. The Capitoline's rear foundations, on the other hand, present longitudinal and transverse foundation walls akin to walls used to support superstructures in temples throughout the archaic Mediterranean. The rear foundations would have supported some kind of walls in the superstructure, and Mura Sommella's suggestion for rooms

[737] Though Mura Sommella has suggested a solution: A. Mura Sommella 2008.
[738] See this volume, Chapter 2.

behind the temple is the most likely scenario.[739] The precise layout of these rooms in correspondence with the foundations remains open to debate (4.51a-c).[740] Whatever their precise arrangement, chambers resting on the rear substructures probably held votives, sacred objects or other items associated with the *area sacra*.[741] There are well known sacred events connected to the area behind the Capitoline Temple, and *postica* have been hypothesized not only in the Ara della Regina, as Mura Sommella suggests, but also in the rectangular temple at Cerveteri, Vigna Parrocchiale, and other rear chambers behind sacred buildings at Satricum and elsewhere.[742]

In sum, literary, archaeological and comparative evidence suggests the existing archaic foundations on the Capitoline supported a tripteral hexastyle temple (*aedes*) with lateral colonnades and three cellas. Behind and attached to the rear wall of the temple building were several sacred chambers. Though perhaps distinct, the rear and front portions were visually linked. The site that I call the Capitoline Temple therefore includes both the *aedes* and the *posticum*.

---

[739] She has recently suggested these walls supported a rear pteron, making the Capitoline peripteral. While the suggestion is possible, it requires a reinterpretation of Dionysius use of the word krepis to mean a Greek peripteral stair. Dionysius, however, often uses the word to mean platform. What is more a peripteral reconstruction does not account for Dionysius description of colonnades on the sides of the temple (and lack of his mentioning a rear pteron) nor does it address Vitruvius' omission of the Capitoline in his discussion of peripteral temples. A. Mura Sommella 2008.

[740] in these reconstructions I reincorporate wall XVIII and it is possible twin XIX, which Mura Sommella does not fit into her reconstruction.

[741] A. Mura Sommella 2000b, 62; cf. G. Colonna 1985, 70-73.

[742] Cifani himself cites them: G. Cifani 2008, 101; M. Cristofani 1992, Pl. I.

## IV. The monumentality of the Temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus

At 73.75 x 53.50 m, the size of the Capitoline Temple has no contemporaneous parallel in the Italic peninsula. As Wilhelm Alzinger, Dieter Mertens and others argue, its dimensions are much closer to temples at Agrigento, Selinunte, Ephesus, Samos and Athens than to Central Italic temples, suggesting Romans were in contact with these Mediterranean powers or at least enduring similar influences.[743] The idea that Rome was wealthy enough to build such a temple and culturally connected enough to participate in the creation or proliferation of a new trend toward monumentality runs in stark contrast to the image most scholars have of the early city. Yet the archaeological evidence is clear: among the cities of Central Italy, Etruscan and Latin alike, Rome's monumental temple suggests an unmatched power and a vanguard of architectural change in the west.[744]

Just three buildings in Italy rival the size of the Capitoline Temple: the upper building at Murlo and the rectangular buildings at Montetosto outside Cerveteri and Centocamere (Fig. 4.23).[745] The largest of these, Murlo, is 60 x 61 m, nearly as large as the Capitoline Temple. Yet the plans, functions, locations and therefore experience that one might have of these buildings is entirely different from one's experience of the

[743] W. Alzinger 1982, 24-26; M. Rendeli 1989, 49; D. Mertens 1994, 195-200; J. M. Turfa and A. G. Steinmayer, Jr. 2002, 6; P. J. E. Davies 2006, 187-190.
[744] On the temple's size in comparison with others in Central Italy: P. J. E. Davies 2006, 187-190.
[745] J. M. Turfa and A. G. Steinmayer, Jr. 2002, 1-9.

Capitoline Temple.[746] The square buildings all have three or four wings surrounding an enclosed or semi-enclosed courtyard, and their exteriors constitute imposing walls with openings on one or two sides.[747] Upon entering the buildings, a viewer would confront a large open central space (porticoed in the case of Murlo) with rooms on the sides (Fig. 4.23). It is unclear who was allowed in the structures and how they functioned. Some believe the square buildings are residences for the royal families of cities or clans, others suggest they are religious sites, *templa*, in the strictest sense; still others suggest they are meeting points, similar to the Faunum Voltumnae that Livy mentions.[748] Most agree, however that they have a mixed function, housing priests or religious peoples, (religious) markets and meeting places for religious or political leagues; a combined political and religious function seems clear.[749] If the buildings were private royal houses, closed to the masses, the exterior wall circuit would have echoed the building's exclusive function, shutting off an unwelcome viewer entirely. If, as seems more likely, they were intended for wider use, the exterior would have been monumental, but due to the function of the building, penetrable, the surrounding rooms and colonnades embracing a large courtyard full of light.[750] This is in stark contrast to the Capitoline Temple. The colonnades on its three sides invite a viewer's gaze into a structure that for its dark, enclosed interior must have seemed overpowering, foreboding and exclusive, while visible and perceivable (Fig.

[746] J. M. Turfa and A. G. Steinmayer, Jr. 2002, 4; G. E. Meyers 2003, 70-116.
[747] J. M. Turfa and A. G. Steinmayer, Jr. 1996, 22-24; J. M. Turfa and A. G. Steinmayer, Jr. 2002, 4.
[748] On the arguments over its function: J. M. Turfa and A. G. Steinmayer, Jr. 2002, 9-10 with references. On the Faunum Voltumnae: Livy VI.2.2.
[749] I. E. M. Edlund-Berry 1992, 205.
[750] On the approach and experience of Archaic Central Italic buildings: G. E. Meyers 2003.

4.52). If people were allowed to penetrate its façade, the further one went inside, the more one was wrapped in the building, stressing its enormous proportions, cavernous interior spaces and a withdrawal from the outside world; this is precisely the opposite of the square buildings.

The topographical character of the square buildings is also distinct from that of the Capitoline Temple. Located outside of urban contexts, either in the countryside or just outside a city, they must have been impressive to those passing by, but only those traversing the countryside or approaching a city along one particular route.[751] The Capitoline Temple's location at the heart of Rome, high above the new Forum Romanum and the Forum Boarium, would have had a strikingly different impact: "it must have been impressive to new inhabitants of Rome, who saw it looming over the morass valley of the Velabrum."[752] The temple was an integral part of the cityscape, and so, anyone coming to Rome from any direction would not only have seen its splendor from afar, they would have conducted their business and experienced the city in its shadow.

Though monumental and certainly impressive, the buildings at Murlo, Montetosto and Centocamere were dramatically different from the Capitoline and whatever their function, their plans and locations indicate an entirely different architectural inspiration and viewer experience. The image, experience and monumental

[751] G. E. Meyers 2003, 70-157.
[752] Author's translation, A. M. Colini 1965, 175.

impact of the Capitoline Temple is best paralleled in temple architecture, especially that of colossal temples found primarily outside of Central Italy in the archaic period.

Of the temples built in Central Italy before the Capitoline Temple, only one structure is remotely comparable in size: the Ara della Regina. The "oikos" temples at Veii (Piazza d'Armi), Tarquinia (beta), Gabii and Satricum were modest structures, the Veii structure being the largest at 12 x 10 m (Fig. 4.53).[753] These were four-walled temples built of mud brick, wattle and daub and wood, with minimal or no foundations. A door cut into one of the short sides articulated the front of the structure and sometimes precinct walls (Tarquinia beta) or a porch (Satricum?, Veii?, Gabii) further marked the buildings as important (Fig. 4.54).[754] The oikos temples at Veii and Satricum also carried some of the earliest fictile revetments in Central Italy.[755] Yet with plans occupying just 3% of the surface area of the Capitoline Temple's and with little other than a porch and terracotta revetments to distinguish them, these temples do not compare to the Capitoline's grandeur. More complex temples existed by the late sixth century at Rome (S. Omobono) and Satricum (Temple I). The two temples built at S. Omobono in Rome are similar in plan to the Piazza d'Armi temple at Veii and the oikos at Satricum, but architects further monumentalized the structure by raising it on a high

[753] E. Stefani 1944, 178-290; G. Colonna 1981b, 51-59; G. Colonna 1984, 396, 400; G. Colonna 1985, 58; H. Damgaard Andersen 1998, 23; G. Colonna 2006, 132-168.
[754] E. Stefani 1944, 178-290; G. Colonna 1981b, 51-59; G. Colonna 1984, 396, 400; G. Colonna 1985, 58; H. Damgaard Andersen 1998, 23; G. Colonna 2006, 132-168.
[755] On the origins of archaic terracotta revetments and roofs in Italy:N. A. Winter 1978, 27-58; Ö. Wikander 1990, 285-290.

podium and creating a distinct sculptural program (Fig. 4.55).[756] On the other hand, Temple I at Satricum is the first temple in Central Italy with colonnades flanking a cella.[757] A rear wall closed off the back of the cella and four frontal columns and an opening in the cella wall indicated the temple's façade (Fig. 4.56). Though monumentalized with revetments, podia and colonnades, and while certainly grand for their sites, when compared to the Capitoline Temple or other monumental temples of the sixth century Mediterranean, the scale of these structures is still unexceptional; the foundations of Temple I at Satricum measure just 33 x 21 m: under 17% the dimensions of the Capitoline Temple (Fig. 4.57). The substructures and podia at these temples were negligible; only three or four courses deep and sometimes only one row of stones wide. Compared to the 23 courses of foundations that are sometimes ten stones wide in the Capitoline Temple, the volume of the largest of these temples is miniscule in comparison with the volume of the stone used for the Temple of Jupiter.

The largest temple in Central Italy that predates or is contemporary with the Capitoline Temple is Phase I/II of the Ara della Regina at Tarquinia (Fig. 4.58). Finds at the site of the temple suggests two archaic phases of construction, in the early-mid to late sixth century.[758] The temple is raised on a tall 55 x 31.5 m platform of square stones; in the superstructure, archaeologists reconstruct alae walls flanking a single cella with a wide

[756] On S. Omobono: this volume, Chapter 2 and e.g. A. Mura Sommella 1977, 62-128; Il viver quotidiano in Roma arcaica: materiali degli scavi del Tempio Arcaico nell'area sacra di S. Omobono 1989. On Satricum, e.g. J. A. K. E. De Waele 1981, 31-41; R. R. Knoop 1987, 7.
[757] J. A. K. E. De Waele 1981, 31-41.
[758] M. Bonghi Jovino 1997, 69-95; cf. N. A. Winter 2006a, 127-144.

central doorway leading to an antechamber occupying the front 1/3 of the cella and a second entrance into the innermost chamber (Fig. 4.58-4.59).[759] Four columns in antis probably fronted the cella. The temple is large: the cella has an interaxial width of eleven meters, just one meter shy of the Capitoline's central cella, and wide alae. The substructure is also deep, like the Capitoline's, but it does not compare tectonically; in fact, its function is very different. At Tarquinia, it does not penetrate more than one course into the earth in comparison to the Capitoline which has over 20 courses buried; also, on the north side, the substructure is only three courses high while the south side is twelve (Fig. 4.60). Rather than serving tectonically as foundations, they serve to extend a platform for the temple off the side of the slope at Tarquinia's Pian della Regina.[760] This produces a dramatic effect, but does not suggest any common practice at both Rome and Tarquinia other than perhaps the ability to quarry stone and an interest in monumentality. A common knowledge may, however, be present in the large width of the cellas. With an internal width of 9.5 m, the cella at Tarquinia has one of the widest unsupported spans in the western Mediterranean. It is comparable to the Megaron at Gaggera, Temple C at Selinunte, and nearly as large as the great expanses of the Athena temple at Syracuse and the Treasury of Gela at Olympia.[761] In Central Italy, only the

[759] M. Bonghi Jovino 1997, fig. 17 shows flanking walls, but reports no evidence to demonstrate walls over a colonnade. On the dimensions: M. Bonghi Jovino 1997, 89. Measurements taken by the author at the site confirm Bonghi Jovino's.
[760] See this volume, Chapter 2 .
[761] T. Hodge 1960, table I p. 39. On the roof, see above, "Reconstructing the Capitoline Temple" on the significance of historical relations between Tarquinia and Rome, see this volume, Chapter V. That both the Capitoline and the temple at Tarquinia are colossal is important, but there are no modular or proportional congruencies and no similar

Capitoline would eclipse it. Yet the hexastyle columnar façade and lateral colonnades of the Roman temple would be much more imposing than the Ara della Regina's, and the foundations of the Capitoline, digging twice as deep into the hill ,and the terracotta revetments, more than double the size of the Tarquinian temple's frieze, are on a scale that is simply not matched in Central Italy. Barring the trussed roof, there is little to compare in the two temples; the superstructure and foundation plans are dissimilar, the terracottas strikingly different and while both are large, the Capitoline still dwarfs the Tarquinian building, its substructures less than half the overall size of the Capitoline's (Fig. 4.61). Ambitious as the builders at Tarquinia were, in the end architects in Rome built a much larger structure with much more impressive decoration; it was not only the largest temple in the Italic peninsula, it was matched in scale by just seven contemporaneous temples in the entire Mediterranean.

By contrast with Central Italy, the Greek world saw a much more apparent interest in colossal temples in the sixth century; architects from Ionia to Athens to Sicily drew on the statement of size starting in the middle of the century. What is more, as in Rome, the trend toward monumentality was new.[762] The Samian Heraion of ca. 570 measures 52.15 x 94.85 and when rebuilt ca. 530 it became the largest Greek temple at 54.59 x 111.02 m.[763] The Temple of Artemis at Ephesus measures 55.1 x 115.14 in ca. 560, and the archaic Temple of Apollo at Didyma (though its size is not entirely certain)

---

measurements; the truss may indicate a connection, but it is the only identifiable link between the two buildings. See below on the many more links between the Capitoline and temples elsewhere.

[762] P. J. E. Davies 2006, 188.

[763] E. Buschor 1930, 72; W. B. Dinsmoor 1975, 124, 134.

probably measured 38.39 x 85.16.[764] On the mainland, the Temple of Olympian Zeus at Athens measures 41.10 x 107.75, and in western Greece, Temple G at Selinunte measures 50.09 x 110.18 and the Olympieion at Agrigento 52.76 x 110.10.[765] All of these were begun either before or during construction of the Capitoline Temple with the exception of Agrigento, which only just post-dates the Roman temple.[766] As at Rome, architects for these temples did not follow any local tradition of monumentality, but seem to have chosen the vast scale as a new means to proclaim greatness or vie for supremacy.[767] The ca. 560 Temple of Artemis at Ephesus is over five times the size of its predecessor; the first colossal Temple of Hera at Samos is over seven times the size of the Orientalizing period temple at the site (Fig. 4.62 a).[768] At Selinunte, the next largest temple that predates Temple G is Temple F, which occupies just one-quarter the surface area of its colossal neighbor (Fig. 4.62 b).[769] The monumentality of these archaic temples was new to Greek architecture, just as the monumentality of the Capitoline Temple, their contemporary, was new to Central Italy. Furthermore, Selinunte and Agrigento were, like Rome, new cities; they do not have architectural histories that stretch further back than a century-and-a-half. The scale of these Greek temples, their break from previous

[764] D. G. Hogarth*, et al.* 1908, 188; W. B. Dinsmoor 1975, 127, 134.
[765] W. B. Dinsmoor 1975, 99, 101; A. W. Lawrence and R. A. Tomlinson 1983, 146. The Athenian temple was not finished until Hadrian, but architects began work and surely intended to complete a colossal structure
[766] W. B. Dinsmoor 1975, 99, 101, 124, 127, 134; A. W. Lawrence and R. A. Tomlinson 1983, 146.
[767] A. Snodgrass 1986, 55.
[768] At Ephesus, Temple C is approximately 25x48m: D. G. Hogarth*, et al.* 1908, 63-73, 288, Plate I. At Samos, the geometric building is ca. 16x40 m: E. Buschor 1930, 10-20.
[769] D. Mertens and M. Schützenberger 2006, 227, 232.

architecture and the new desire for monumentality that they evidence fits much more closely with the Capitoline Temple than do temples in Central Italy. The comparison this presents between Rome and the Mediterranean has two sweeping implications.

First, Rome's economic and cultural wherewithal approaches that of Ephesus, Athens, Selinunte and other major Mediterranean polities. The sheer size of the Capitoline and volume of materials for its construction indicate archaic Rome was a much more powerful city than scholars have believed.[770] Penelope Davies has suggested that the author of the Roman temple "chose an international language of monumentality," identifying and harnessing the statement that only colossal architecture could make.[771] Central Italic architects, while building big, had not yet dared to build temples on a colossal scale; that Rome joined Agrigento, Selinunte, Athens, Ephesus, Samos and Didyma as boasting one of the seven largest temples in the archaic Mediterranean speaks clearly of its economic capacities and its vision. The city must have been powerful, a player in Mediterranean politics and commerce. Still, early Romans did not, as far as we know, produce the volume of monumental temples that Athens, Agrigento and Selinunte did; the twin temples at S. Omobono and the Temple of Castor certainly suggest a continued ability to build big, but it is necessary to take a cautious view of the city's economy.

Second, Rome did not follow the trend in monumentality; it helped establish it. Colossal temples have origins in the east starting in the early-mid sixth century at

[770] P. J. E. Davies 2006, 187-190; G. Cifani 2008, 288-295.
[771] P. J. E. Davies 2006, 189.

Ephesus and Samos; architects in the west only began looking to monumentality at the end of the century.[772] Rome's temple is contemporary with monumental reconstructions from Samos and Ephesus, but also with the very first colossal buildings at Agrigento, Selinunte and Athens, ca. 530-490. This suggests Rome was helping to lead the west in the advent of the colossal temple and may have done so based on ties to the east, as I discuss below. Thus, Rome was not only wealthy, it was interested in the overwhelming impression that only eastern architectural vocabulary could foster in its own local topography. By the late sixth century, the interest in foreign cultures that is clear in buildings at S. Omobono and the Forum lead Rome to be a leader in architectural change for the Western Mediterranean. The idea is in contrast to previous ideas of early Rome and bears further consideration. As to Roman contact with Sicily, Athens and Ionia, I have in previous chapters proposed that Rome was an open city; the size of the Capitoline Temple supports this claim. A closer look at the manner in which Romans planned and constructed their temple may further demonstrate greater, prolonged communication between architects at Rome and the wider Mediterranean as well as Rome' participation in a new Western architecture.

## V. Foreign influence and local tradition in the Capitoline Temple

[772] D. G. Hogarth*, et al.* 1908, 188; E. Buschor 1930, 72; W. B. Dinsmoor 1975, 124, 134. Of course, monumentality is relative; a few temples, like Artemis at Corfu may have spurred the interest in larger temples.

Mertens argues that the similar sizes of the Capitoline Temple and the Temple of Zeus at Agrigento or Temple G at Selinunte suggests profound culture contact between architects in Sicily and Central Italy.[773] He suggests that while a ceramic vessel or a statue may be traded without significant contact between manufacturer and buyer, one cannot propose a major work of architecture without the long-term aid of a people who know how to build it.[774] This is especially true when dealing with complex tectonics, such as the roof of the Capitoline Temple. A comparison of building plans and techniques at Rome with techniques and designs at other sites in the Mediterranean may reveal further evidence for close and prolonged culture contact and a shared interest in the adaptation of eastern architectural style.

The architecture of the Capitoline Temple can be divided into three sections: foundation, superstructure and roof.

**The foundations**

The substructure of the Capitoline Temple is almost entirely without precedent in Central Italy; in it, builders used a series of interconnecting longitudinal and transverse walls to support walls, colonnades and thresholds in the superstructure. By contrast, most archaic Central Italic temples have pillars (not walls) under columns (Fig. 4.63).[775]

[773] D. Mertens 1994, 203.
[774] D. Mertens 1994, 196-197.
[775] E.g. Tarquinia: M. Bonghi Jovino 1997, 87-89, fig. 17; G. Colonna 2006, VIII.34; Vulci: B. Massabò 1988-1989, 103-135; Orvieto: L. Pernier 1926, 137-164; Ardea, E. Stefani 1954, 6-

The only temple that predates the Capitoline and shares its foundation type is Temple I at Satricum, which dates ca. 525 (Fig. 4.56).[776] At Satricum, however, Patricia Lulof, Dieter Mertens and others have argued a dominant Campanian and Greek influence especially visible in the roof system.[777] If one follows the link to Greek architecture that the Satricum temple suggests, a clear comparison for the Capitoline foundations appears. If it is difficult to find comparanda for the Capitoline foundations in Central Italy, comparisons abound in the Greek world from Paestum to Metapontum, Agrigento, Corinth, Delos, Ephesus and elsewhere. Throughout archaic Greek sanctuaries, architects built foundation walls underneath all load-bearing elements: peripteroi, naos and opisthodimos / adyton walls and colonnades inside naoi and pronaoi (Fig. 4.64).[778]

---

30; Lanuvium: A. Galieti 1928, 75-118. Exceptions postdating the Capitoline are Marzabotto, Temple C: E. Brizio 1889, 258-260 Pl. I-X; Pyrgi A and B: G. Colonna 1965, 191-219; G. Colonna and M. Pallottino 1970, 36-43, 275-287; Rome Castor: I. Nielsen and J. Zahle 1985, 61-79, esp. 76. Scholars have argued that each of these sites experienced significant Greek influence. I suggest Greek influence on the Temple of Castor: this volume, Chapter 1. On the other sites: G. Colonna 1965, 192; D. Mertens 1980, 49.

[776] J. A. K. E. De Waele 1981, 7-68; P. Chiarucci and T. Gizi 1985, 47-53;

[777] G. Colonna 1965, 192; D. Mertens 1980, 49; P. S. Lulof 2006; N. A. Winter 2006b, 45-49.

[778] Cf. Archaic temples at Samos, Ephesus, Dydima, Delos, Athens, Delphi, Corinth, Perachora, Corfu, Metapontum, Paestum, Agrigento, Selinunte, Syracuse, and elsewhere. D. Mertens and M. Schützenberger 2006, 97-155, 216-309, on Archaic temples in general: W. B. Dinsmoor 1975, 69-113, 123-146; A. W. Lawrence and R. A. Tomlinson 1983, 141-159, 160-173, on the correlation between foundations and superstructures in Greek architecture, e.g. J. M. Cook and R. V. Nicholls 1998, 11-12; F. A. Cooper 2008, 230-234 On specific sites, e.g. Metapontum – D. Adamesteanu*, et al.* 1975, passim, esp. 109; Assos, F. H. Bacon*, et al.* 1902, 141, plate 141; Samos Heraia – E. Buschor 1930, 1-162, esp. 172; Temple of Apollo at Delos – F. Courby 1931, pl. II, III; Locri – A. De Franciscis 1979, 59-100, figs. 105-134; On Paestum (Foce del Sele) – J. De La Geniere*, et al.* 1997, 337-344; J. De La Geniere*, et al.* 1999, 501-507; Corinth – H. N. Fowler*, et al.* 1932, pl. I, V; Didyma – G. Gruben 1963, esp. 78-85; Ephesus – D. G. Hogarth*, et al.* 1908, pl. I, XII Naxos – V. Lambrinoudakis and G. Gruben 1987, 569-621 abb. 513; Paestum (Hera I) – D. Mertens*, et al.* 1993, 5-15, Tafel 14-17, 20; Syracuse (Olympieion) – P. Orsi 1903, 369-391; Apollo Alaei – P. Orsi 1933, 22-27, figs. 23-24; Corfu – G. Rodenwaldt 1939, Tafel 3, 22. In my survey I found only three

Just as with the Capitoline and Satricum, in the Greek world, longitudinal and transverse walls indiscriminately support walls, colonnades and thresholds in the superstructure. The broad analogy suggests that the Roman temple foundations are akin to Greek substructures, but one particularly striking comparandum suggests more than a vague association. In both the Samian Heraion and the Capitoline Temple, longitudinal and transverse foundations support colonnades and cella walls; conspicuous in their plans is the architects' use of the same partial foundation under the third colonnade of both temples (Fig. 4.48).[779] Foundations are visible only to those who witness a temple's construction, and for one architect to copy or mirror another's foundations suggests an intimate knowledge of construction process. While there may be other examples of foundations like those at Samos (perhaps under the collapsed Temple G at Selinunte) it is tempting to see a single architect's fingerprint on the Samian and Roman colossal tripteral temples with unique matching foundations.

**The superstructure**

---

Archaic Greek temples do not follow this, the Temple of Dionysus on Naxos, the Marasà sanctuary at Locri and the Temple of Apollo Alaei. These have foundation walls under all superstructure walls and colonnades, but pillars supporting the three or four naos/opisthodomos columns (that is, interior columns).

[779] See above, note 706.

While scholars may debate specific aspects of the Capitoline Temple's reconstruction, most agree that the temple had three frontal colonnades, lateral colonnades and a triple cella (Fig. 4.65).[780]

The side columns and colonnaded porch are anomalous in Central Italy. As with the foundation plan, only Temple I at Satricum has lateral colonnades that predate the Capitoline's; again, scholars believe Greek or Campanian workers had a strong hand in this temple's design.[781] In comparison, side ptera were an indispensable part of Greek temple architecture; one hardly needs to describe or enumerate examples: they flank the naos of nearly every temple in the Greek world from the seventh to third centuries. As for the Capitoline's frontal forest of columns, there is no earlier temple and no earlier foundation in Central Italy that remotely suggests a triple colonnaded porch. Even in the Greek world it is hard to find a precedent. Architects at Syracuse, Metapontum, Selinunte and further from Rome at Samos and Ephesus had already experimented with double colonnades.[782] In the years preceding the Capitoline's completion, architects at Athens, Ephesus and Samos were more daring and started temples with triple colonnaded porches.[783] Few scholars are willing to see early Rome as an open city, with contacts and architects from as far as Athens or especially Ionia, but there is simply no precedent for anything like the Capitoline's tripteral hexastyle façade in Central Italy or

[780] See above, "Refining the reconstruction."
[781] see above, note 751.
[782] Syracuse-Apollo, Syracuse-Olympieion, Selinunte-C, Metaponto-A II and similar, Metaponto-B I, Locri-Marasà: D. Mertens and M. Schützenberger 2006, 108, 111, 121, 151, 137.
[783] G. Cifani 2008, 292 makes this comparison.

even the Italic peninsula and Sicily.[784] While it is possible that Romans imagined the design on their own, its absence in Central Italy before the Capitoline and its simultaneous adoption in colossal temples in Sicily on the heels of Ionian prototypes suggests a connection amongst colossal Mediterranean temples. What is more, the implementation of the forested facade, the construction of the stacked tuff pillars and the complex trabeation of a multi-colonnaded porch would require the aid of architects who had built this kind of structure before. The Capitoline's lateral and frontal ptera betray a strong Greek architectural influence; that the temple lacks a rear colonnade only makes sense. The religious functions and architectural history of Greek temples did not necessarily require a frontal disposition.[785] Early Central Italic sanctuary architecture, on the other hand, is defined largely by a viewer's frontal approach to a temple; as Mertens has pointed out, only two peripteral temples existed in archaic Central Italy, both in communities heavily influenced by Greeks, and still, a frontal staircase dictated these buildings' primary façades.[786] Peripteral temples were not popular in Central Italy, probably for religious or architectural historical purposes: divination, augury, foundation ritual, or some other religious practices seem to have required a frontal disposition, and by the sixth century, architectural tradition in Central Italy dictated that a building's rear

[784] Davies, Rendeli and others have looked to Ionia in regard to the Capitoline's dimensions; only Cifani has suggested a direct connection based on the frontal colonnades.
[785] There are exceptions, especially the oikos of the Naxians on Delos and the Naxian Temple of Dionysus, but these are the exceptions that prove the rule.
[786] Pyrgi B and Satricum Temple II: D. Mertens 1980. On approach to buildings in Central Italy and earlier frontal religious precedents: G. Colonna 1981b, 51-59; G. Colonna 1984, 396-411; G. Colonna 1985; G. E. Meyers 2003, 1-5; G. Colonna 2006, 132-168.

be closed.[787] The rear wall and resulting frontal disposition of the Capitoline Temple expresses its fundamental Central Italic religious function.[788] Architects did not sacrifice the needs of the people who commissioned the temple to architectural form. The ptera do however indicate the marriage of previously unseen Greek architectural elements to established Central Italic tradition. This kind of radical change in architectural and tectonic practice would require a significant and prolonged connection between Greek architects and Rome.[789]

At the same time that architects were reestablishing local trends and experimenting with Greek styles they were also creating experimenting with an architectural element that was uncommon to the entire Mediterranean basin: by all rights, the Capitoline is the first known temple in the Mediterranean to employ a triple cella in such a grand structure. Contact with Punic architects, who used triple cellas in their temples, may have influenced the new arrangement, but it is not clear if Punic temples had triple cellas before the sixth century.[790] On the other hand, a three-room building at Murlo dates to the late seventh century and hosted some kind of sacred activity; excavators are still hesitant to brand this a triple cella or even a religious building.[791] Building beta at Tarquinia, best known as one of the earliest oikos temples/buildings in

[787] G. Colonna 1981b, 51-59; G. Colonna 1984, 396-411; G. Colonna 1985; G. Colonna 2006, 132-168.
[788] Alzinger was the first to suggest Romans adapted a Greek temple for their own religious needs, but he is less specific as to how: W. Alzinger 1982, 24-26.
[789] Especially for the engineering of the columns, porch and roofing: D. Mertens 1994, 196-197.
[790] P. Pensabene 1990.
[791] E. O. Nielsen and A. S. Tuck 2001, esp. 44-45.

Central Italy, seems to have been transformed into a three-room structure in the middle seventh century, and while it may have been as much the seat of a priestly chief as it was a temple, this too provides a predecessor in the region with three rooms and a religious function.[792] Like the Murlo building, it is a structure made up entirely of those three cellas; there are no columns; there is no porch, and there is no podium, so it does not follow the same design as the Capitoline. A true precedent for a triple cella structure like the Temple of Jupiter in Rome is therefore illusive. Whether the three-room configuration is Punic or (more likely) native to Central Italy, Romans seem to have brought its uncomplicated design into a intricate framework of columns and podia, elaborating the form in the Capitoline Temple. One may discount the innovation as purely necessary: a triple dedication (Jupiter, Juno and Minerva) required a triple cella. Yet the Capitoline triad created the opportunity for a triple cella; it did not demand it. Multiple deities are worshiped in one room at other sanctuaries, and architects at Rome could have continued that tradition. It may have been an *easy* choice to build a cella for each deity, but it was still a choice. Furthermore, a triple dedication is innovative in its own right. Not unlike Rome's seizure of Juno Regina from Veii or the appropriation of the Dioscouri from Latium, Jupiter, Juno and Minerva all had cults in rival Latin cities that predated their sanctuary in Rome, and Jean Bayet argues that by creating the Capitoline triad, Romans commandeered the deities of powerful neighboring states in a bid for supremacy.[793] Fitting these deities in an architecturally innovative and visually

[792] M. Bonghi Jovino 1999. Cf. F. Prayon 2004; F. Prayon 2009, 60-61 with references
[793] J. Bayet 1969, 40. For Veii and Rome (Castor): this volume, Chapter 1.

impressive temple would reinforce this gesture. In any event, Romans built the first known temple of this kind. The triple cella was unique to Rome in the late sixth century, but it would not remain so; architects emulated this feature in numerous subsequent temples.[794]

In the Temple of Jupiter, Romans pioneered a new architecture; it incorporated Hellenic lateral colonnades and a tripteral porch into a traditional Central Italic temple with frontal disposition and a high podium supporting an innovative triple cella. The lateral colonnades are among the first in Central Italy and are certainly the first on so large a scale. The tripteral porch is new not only to Rome, but to the Western Mediterranean, finding comparanda at Athens, Ephesus and Samos; this is precisely where one finds a tradition of colossal temples, and even a precedent for the Capitoline foundations. At the same time Romans adopted this new scale of construction, western Greek architects at Selinunte and Agrigento began harnessing the statement of size. Scholars have long noted that Sicilians adapt eastern styles to their own needs, and it seems Romans were doing the same, participating in the creation of a new architecture for the Western Mediterranean.[795] Meanwhile, the triple cella had no known precedent; while it may seem a change without great invention (simply tripling a single cella), it is an alteration to fundamental sanctuary design that Greeks would not choose to make. The end result is a temple that combines superstructure elements from abroad with

[794] See below.
[795] The adoption of eastern styles in Sicilian and western Greek architecture is a large field. E.g. B. A. Barletta 1983; B. A. Barletta 2000, 203-216; D. Mertens and M. Schützenberger 2006, 90-256.

traditional local design and innovative plans unique to Rome; the grouping would spread throughout Central Italy on the heels of the completion of the Capitoline Temple.[796]

### The Roof

I argue above that Romans capped the stone superstructure of the Capitoline Temple with a trussed roof and terracotta sima with anthemion decoration. Like the foundations and the temple plan, the trussed roof may have Sicilian origins, but architects could have also looked to buildings at Tarquinia and Murlo. It is safe to say that there were plenty of precedents for the trabeation, but it is difficult to pinpoint a source. The revetments, however, again point to Greek precedents and signify a dramatic change. Before the Capitoline, the standard revetment type in Central Italy had figural decoration with scenes of chariot racing, procession and banquets (Fig. 4.54); the new style fundamentally changed the image of Central Italic roofs.[797] More than simply replacing the established frieze iconography, it caused a shift in the role of sima decoration. Anthemion revetments were much larger than their figural predecessors, and so the terracotta decoration of simas and architraves became far more prominent; by the same token, the repetition of floral design did not require the viewer's analytical attention

[796] See below, "The influences of the Capitoline Temple."
[797] N. A. Winter 2009b, 1-2.

in the same way that scenes on figural friezes did, and so acroteria, antefixes, and columen plaques became the focus of large complex decoration on temples (4.66).[798]

The Capitoline is one of the first known Central Italic temples to employ an anthemion frieze (Fig. 4.6). At the end of the sixth century, again at Satricum in Temple I, architects broke away from an 80-year tradition of iconographic, formal and stylistic design when they chose a floral decoration for the revetments of their temple.[799] Completed ca. 525, just 15 years before the Capitoline, the Satricum temple is yet again a forbearer of trends made popular at Rome (Fig. 4.67). It is rare that so long an artistic tradition of style, iconography and form is interrupted, and when it is, it usually indicates a striking impact from an outside source.[800] While largely absent from Central Italic temple design, floral friezes and specifically anthemion revetments are common among late-sixth-century Greek cornice and sima decoration. The Athena Sanctuary at Syracuse has a band of floral decorations including palmettes and floral water spouts on the sima; Temple C at Selinunte and the eneastyle Temple of Hera at Paestum also have anthemion decoration on the frontal sima.[801] In these temples the anthemion decorates metopes or thin bands along the top of the sima, and it is painted. These are striking distinctions from the Capitoline where the anthemion is a running frieze in painted relief and the predominant sima decoration.

---

[798] I came to this realization through extended conversations with Nancy Winter.
[799] A. Andrén 1940, 149, pl. 139.488.
[800] I. Hodder 2005, esp. 18-20.
[801] P. Orsi 1903, 369-391; D. Mertens and M. Schützenberger 2006, 123-125; a roof from Minturno is contemporary with this, but scholars see this building and site as much as a Hellenic / Campanian site as they do a Latin site: N. A. Winter 2006b.

Barbara Barletta argues that as a continuous sculpted sima decoration, the anthemion has its western genesis in the Ionicizing influence of late-sixth-century Naxos.[802] A Naxos anthemion dates to ca. 525 and is robust in style, with thick bulbous palmettes and scrolls (Fig. 4.68). The Satricum frieze and reliefs from Minturno, also ca. 525, are similar to the Naxos frieze, though the edges are more angular. Soon after this, comparable anthemion decoration appears around Sicily, especially at Agrigento.[803] In contrast to all of these, the reliefs on the Capitoline are more delicate: palmette leaves are longer and curved, each circumscribed with a thin, recessed, painted band, and individual contours of interspersed lotus calyces are carved and painted (see figs. 4.5–4.6 and 4.24–4.25). The Roman relief is much closer to the delicate styles of Central Italic antefix palmettes from Satricum, Civita Castellana and elsewhere, suggesting the amalgamation of Ionicizing Greek forms with Central Italic styles. At Satricum, Minturno and in Western Greek architecture, the raised anthemion revetments were a new architectural decorative scheme in the late sixth century. The frieze appeared in a summary style almost simultaneously at Naxos and lower Central Italy; within fifteen years a vast roof sharing their form, but with a more refined rendering was in place on the Capitoline Temple. The decoration was not just avant-garde for Central Italy but also for the Western Mediterranean. The parallel incorporation of this monumental frieze type at Agrigento, Naxos, Satricum and Rome in the very late sixth century suggests these cities

[802] B. A. Barletta 1983, 21, 24-25; cf. D. Mertens and M. Schützenberger 2006, 127-128.
[803] B. A. Barletta 1983, 270-271.

were contemporaneously advancing the same new sculptural vocabulary, the Roman temple being the first to bring the form fully into the stylistic tradition of Central Italy.

It is hard to speak of the Ionicizing style of the Capitoline revetments and their similarity to Sicilian architectural revetments without remembering the similarity of the Capitoline Temple's plan, size and trabeation to temples in Sicily. Barbara Barletta argues that Ionicizing monumental decoration in the Greek west indicates not just a connection between the sculptural styles of Sicily and Ionia, but between architecture and architects working across the Mediterranean.[804] Among many others, Irad Malkin and Nicolas Purcell speak of vast shipping networks in the archaic Mediterranean; exchanges connecting east and west, north and south to a degree that had never before been seen: architects, artists, merchants, rulers, all traveling from Persia to Phoenecia, Egypt, Ephesus, Corinth, Agrigento and it seems, to Rome.[805] Architects of the Capitoline Temple adopted new Ionic and Ionicizing sculptural styles alongside a similarly eastern foundation plan, colossal proportion and colonnades at precisely the same time that Selinunte and Agrigento saw a similar architectural shift. The simultaneity of changes at these sites suggests Romans were not drawing on South Italic and Sicilian statements of monumentality as authors have previously suggested, but that alongside these powers of the west, they were participating in the creation and promotion of a new western Mediterranean monumentality.

[804] B. A. Barletta 1983; B. A. Barletta 1993, 55-65; B. A. Barletta 2000, 203-216.
[805] P. Horden and N. Purcell 2000; I. Malkin 2005.

## VI. Conclusion

### The idea of a colossal Temple of Jupiter in archaic Rome

The Capitoline Temple is a unique building in the archaic Mediterranean; no other temple combines scale, design, tectonics or decoration in the same way. Some scholars have used its abnormality to suggest that such an anomalous structure could not have existed.[806] Yet every temple of this size is idiosyncratic, each one in its own way "the only temple." The Olympieion at Agrigento is the only monumental temple with columns engaged in curtain walls and colossal statues supporting the roof; Temple G at Selinunte is the only Doric temple remotely close to its scale. The Temple of Apollo at Didyma and the Temple of Artemis at Ephesus are both hypaethral, and the thick walls of the Didyma temple's naos with engaged pilasters are unique.[807] The Artemision is the first dipteral temple in Greek architectural history and the lower portion of front column shafts have relief decoration, a Near Eastern style that is not common in Greek temple architecture.[808] The plan of the fourth Temple of Hera at Samos is the largest of any Greek Temple ever attempted and its tripteral front and rear are a rare choice.[809] Were it

[806] J. W. Stamper 2005, 24.
[807] G. Gruben 1963, 78-182; J. Feye 1970, 88-99; W. B. Dinsmoor 1975, 99, 101, 124, 127, 134; A. W. Lawrence and R. A. Tomlinson 1983, 146; D. Mertens and M. Schützenberger 2006, 261-266, Figs. 466-472.
[808] W. B. Dinsmoor 1975, 127.
[809] W. B. Dinsmoor 1975, 124.

not for remains of their superstructures, scholars could argue that each of these temples combined too many foreign or extraordinary elements to have really existed. It is equally nonsensical to say that the Capitoline Temple could not have existed on this scale or with this grandeur simply because it is unusual.

In this chapter I have argued that the temple not only *can* be reconstructed as a monumental building, but that it *must* be reconstructed so. Arguing that the Capitoline temple occupied only the central four foundation walls relegates over two thirds of the surface area of the colossal foundations to support for a non-load-bearing pavement; no known archaic temple in the Mediterranean has substructures that are so much larger than the superstructure, nor do any such massive foundations support so large a non-load-bearing surface. The revetments at Rome double the height of the next largest revetments in Central Italy, just as the foundation depth and area doubles the next largest foundations in Central Italy. This and other evidence indicates the building was designed to be a unique, colossal temple without precedent or rival.

The idea of the colossal archaic Capitoline Temple has been hard for modern scholars to accept. Yet all evidence points to its existence. One must therefore ask what its presence means. The Temple combines tectonics and design from multiple polities and cultures. The wide primary cella may find precedent at Tarquinia, but Romans take it to a new place with their temple. The roofing structure finds models either in buildings like Murlo and the Ara della Regina or in temples at Agrigento, Selinunte, Olympia and elsewhere in Western Greece. The plan of the foundations indicates a traditionally Greek system of substructure walls especially akin to those at Samos, and

the lateral and frontal colonnades reflect Greek temple architecture. Furthermore, the anthemion decoration of the roof has clear origins in Ionicizing friezes from Naxos that find their way to Sicily and southern and central Italy precisely when they reach Rome. The scale of the building is matched only by six archaic temples: two in Sicily, one in Athens and three in Ionia. Meanwhile, the triple cella has no clear precedent in Greek or Central Italic culture.

This combination of architectural styles reflects the people who built the temple. To create the structure they looked outside their city and outside of their region to the great powers of the Mediterranean. The audacity of the project, the economic needs of so large an endeavor, the adoption of Ionicizing revetments, colonnades and scale at precisely the same moment that major Western Greek polities embraced eastern style suggest that Rome was a significant player in Mediterranean culture. To build a structure, especially one on this scale, architects at Rome must not only have known how to design the building, they would have known how to implement the tectonics involved in executing the design. An isolated community of Romans could not simply hear of buildings like the Artemision at Ephesus and reconstruct them to their own specifications; they must have connected with architects and engineers who knew how to build these structures. What is more, the project demonstrates a tremendous economic presence at Rome: the enormous amount of quarrying, transportation and on-site construction needs indicates a vast resource of expendable labor. Together, interest in Eastern Mediterranean forms and the economic and infrastructural necessities of this building suggest a significant polity with substantial power. The idea of the Capitoline

Temple and its execution reveal archaic Rome as a powerful city, and alongside earlier and contemporaneous projects in the Forum and at S. Omobono, it is Romans' most audacious attempt at garnering prestige through architectural output.

### The Influence of the Capitoline Temple

If the Temple of Capitoline Jupiter signifies Rome as an open, powerful culture in the late archaic Mediterranean, it is also because of the tremendous influence it exerted on subsequent temple architecture. When creating the temple, architects used foreign, local and original architectural elements to create a distinctive new form. On the heels of the temple's completion, elements combined at Rome for the first time became popular in temples throughout Central Italy, changing temple architecture not just within the region but in the following centuries, throughout the Roman empire.

For most of the past century architectural historians seeking to describe a typical *Etruscan* Temple looked to the Capitoline.[810] Yet scholars have remained skeptical of including the temple in histories of Rome.[811] If scholars refer to it in books on Roman architecture, it is as a forerunner, not a participant in the history of Roman temple design, and its effects on later temples are only discussed amongst other early Italic

[810] e.g. G. Colonna 1985, 60; A. Boëthius*, et al.* 1994, 41-42.
[811] cf. D. S. Robertson 1945, 200; F. E. Brown 1961; F. Sear 1989, 10-11; A. Boëthius*, et al.* 1994, 41-42.

precedents.[812] Only recently have Pierre Gros and Penelope Davies brought the temple into the sphere of Roman religious architecture.[813] Both state only that the temple must have been a model for later temples; they do not investigate specific aspects of the building's influence.[814] The temple remains stuck in the sixth century: a model of early Italic temples, if anything a vague antecedent of architecture of the third century and beyond.

One reason for the temple's isolation is its previously debated size and plan; I hope this chapter has clarified at least some basic aspects of its architecture. The other reason scholars segregate the temple from Roman architectural history is its debated political context. Some believe the Capitoline is the product of Etruscan influence on Rome, and therefore it is *not* a work of Roman architecture. While the idea of Etruscan Rome is hotly debated, I believe the building's place in Roman architectural history does not depend on the outcome of this dispute. The temple is squarely in the city of Rome, high on the most prominent hill. Whatever the political or historical circumstances of its construction, it remained one of the city's preeminent temples throughout the Republic and Empire when ancient authors consistently refer to it as a Roman building. By way of comparison one might say that removing the temple and its influence from Roman architectural history is tantamount to removing Independence Hall from American

[812] Stamper is an exception to this, though his suggestions are based on a very different reconstruction and reasoning. He implies that architects building in the Empire still look directly to the Capitoline for inspiration, and his arguments depend on a circular comparison between the Capitoline, the Temple of Mars Ultor and the Pantheon.
[813] P. Gros 2006, 136-137; P. J. E. Davies*, et al.* 2007, 179.
[814] Both being surveys, they could not go into greater depth on the subject of the Capitoline Temple.

architectural history. Though built during British rule in 1755, Independence Hall marked a new architecture that evolved, endured and influenced design in the United States for centuries. Scholars regard it not as a British building in America, and not as a precursor to American style, but as an emblem of change that fundamentally shaped American public architecture.[815] Rome's political circumstances during the late sixth century may have influenced *how* people chose to build the Capitoline Temple; they may have affected *how* the temple brought about stylistic change in Central Italy, but in the end, the temple was built, and it transformed temple architecture for the Roman Republic and Empire.

Those who do see significance in the Capitoline Temple often suggest that its influence is monolithic. Stamper sees it as directly influencing temples like Mars Ultor and the Pantheon; Colonna, Boëthius and others uphold it as a model of the Central Italic temple.[816] But for all the buildings that do borrow from the Capitoline none approach its scale, only a few employ the rear rooms and none combine a triple cella with lateral colonnades. Thus, I believe the Capitoline's role in the history of Roman architecture is not as a model, or as a *typical* Italic or Roman temple; rather I argue one should see its influence as diffuse. It was a touchstone, a temple that people borrowed from and emulated but did not reproduce. It helped define religious architecture not because it prompted copies, but because its grandeur popularized elements that individually and collectively came to exemplify Italic and Roman temples.

---

[815] L. M. Roth 1979, 2-52; M. Whiffen and F. Koeper 1981, 3-106; D. P. Handlin 1985, 9-38.
[816] G. Colonna 1985, 60; A. Boëthius*, et al.* 1994, 41-42; P. Gros 2001, 136-137; J. W. Stamper 2005, 132, 204-205.

Before the Capitoline, three elements distinguish Central Italic temples: they are marked by a frontal disposition, sometimes highlighted by a high podium and stair; they have only a few frontal columns and almost never a true colonnade like those one finds in Greek temples; and their architraves are decorated with continuous relief as opposed to staccato Doric sculpture or continuous plain Ionic friezes.[817] Scholars hold that the temple at S. Omobono of ca. 570 is the earliest to combine several of these elements. Though its precise plan remains in doubt, it probably would have been a single-cella temple, perhaps with alae; it was raised on a high podium with a torus moulding particular to Central Italy and was accessible only by frontal staircase; columns in antis probably accentuated its primary façade and it had revetments on its architrave and sima.[818] Though one certainly finds other architectural elements in early Central Italic temples, none appear consistently in more than two before the Capitoline.

The Capitoline Temple combined a far greater number of architectural elements than had previously been seen: some that had not appeared in Central Italy before, others that had not previously been combined in a single Italic temple. The cella is arguably the most essential part of a temple; the Capitoline is the first known temple to have three. It is also the earliest known temple with more than one row of columns fronting a cella and is only the second known prostyle temple in Central Italy.[819] It is only

[817] see above.
[818] See Chapter 2.
[819] Prostyle as opposed to *in antis*. Ganzert and Damgaard Andersen suggest that Castagnoli's modern term 'peripteros sine postico' should not be used as there was no ancient theory or nomenclature for a building of this type. Rather, they suggest this is a prostyle temple with colonnades on the sides: J. Ganzert 1990; H. Damgaard Andersen 1998.

the second temple in Central Italy to have lateral colonnades.[820] It has the high podium that the S. Omobono Temples seem to have made popular and also has continuous frieze revetments like S. Omobono. The iconography, style and form of the frieze are, however, new. The Capitoline Temple is just the second temple in Central Italy to have an anthemion frieze. It also employs a previously unseen set of transverse and longitudinal substructure walls to support colonnades and walls in the superstructure.

Less than half a century after its completion, temples at Satricum (Temple II), Ardea (Acropolis, Casalinaccio), Vulci (Fontanile di Legnisina), Veii (Portonaccio), Lanuvium, Rome (Castor), Pyrgi (Temples A and B), Orvieto and Marzabotto (Temple C) combined at least four of these elements. Of all Central Italic temples built between ca. 510 and 450, nine temples have deep porches, at least three have lateral colonnades, five employ a grid of foundation walls, eleven have podia, at least seven and probably all have floral friezes, six have triple cellas and at least nine have frontal colonnades, six of which are dipteral and at least one tripteral (Figs. 4.63, 4.69–4.70). Of the 13 known temples built between ca. 510 and 450 for which both architectural and terracotta evidence is preserved, a clear majority assemble the elements of the Capitoline Temple in one form or another.[821] Furthermore, this list only considers elements that remain in the Capitoline's archaeological record. Most of the Capitoline's superstructure is missing, and so it is impossible to know if the building also had mouldings on the podium, what

[820] The other is Temple I at Satricum.
[821] Cf. plan of temples by Gabriele Cifani, this volume fig. 4.69. This image omits Ardea, Acropolis sanctuary, which has a deep, multiple colonnaded porch, floral revetments and triple cella.

kind of columns and capitals adorned it, whether or not it had ridgepole sculpture, full-bodied acroteria and antefixes or various other details. It probably did incorporate several of these features, many of which became popular just after the Capitoline's completion.

Several elements that the Capitoline featured for the first time endured in temple architecture through the Roman Republic and Empire. The triple cella is not only found in later capitolia; architects used it in other temples through the Republic, even in some with only one or two dedicatees.[822] Architects would continue to use the anthemion frieze throughout Central Italy and in Rome until the late Republic, at first in temples at Ardea, Satricum, Lanuvium, and later in Hellenistic structures like the Temple at Talamone and Temple of Apollo at Civita Castellana (Fig. 4.71). After its popularization in Italy through the roof sculpture of the Capitoline, the anthemion frieze remained a principle decorative motif in all varieties of architecture through the empire in structures such as the Tomb of the Sempronii and Ara Pacis Augusti.[823] Multiple frontal colonnades also remained common. They are found immediately after the Capitoline at Pyrgi, Ardea, Orvieto and elsewhere, and they remained popular in Roman temples like those to Castor, Victoria, Venus Genetrix, and the Pantheon. Though Vitruvius does not provide a name for the temple plan commonly called a *peripteros sine postico*, after the Capitoline, the type remained popular in Roman architecture, as evidenced by buildings like Temple C in Largo Argentina and the Temple of Mars Ultor in the Forum of

[822] E.g. the Temples of Castor and Pollux and of Saturn in Rome and the Temple of Jupiter in Pompeii (often referred to as a capitolium).
[823] On the Tomb: P. J. E. Davies 2009.

Augustus. The deep porch was almost ubiquitous in later temples; Central Italic architects immediately adopt it at Pyrgi, Ardea, Orvieto, Lanuvium and elsewhere, and it remained popular in Roman temples through the Empire, the most famous examples of the style being the Temple of Portunus and the Maison Carrée.

The Capitoline Temple sparked a sea change in Central Italic and Roman temple architecture. Before it, architects relied on a small variety of elements for variation in new religious buildings; changing proportions, adding a few columns in antis, a different revetment scene or perhaps a unique pediment sculpture defined the designer's options. After the Capitoline temple architects had a vastly larger trove of embellishment to use in temple design. What is more, previously, a temple might introduce one or two new architectural elements; the Capitoline Temple popularized at least six. Yet the building was not an archetype for later religious architecture. Rather, I believe it had a nuanced impact: in one action, it promoted more of what became traditional elements of Roman temple design than all temples before it, combined. Architects throughout Central Italy quickly and ceaselessly pulled from its components, and there would be no such radical change or addition to the design of Roman temples until centuries later when stone architraves and peripteral designs entered the architect's vocabulary. Even then, elements first made popular in the Capitoline Temple pervaded Roman architecture. One sees the deep porch, a forest of frontal columns, lateral colonnades, triple cellas, deep foundations and floral revetments in temples through the end of the Republic and well into the Empire.

# Chapter 5

## Conclusions: The Changing City and its Architecture

During the sixth century, the Capitoline Hill underwent extraordinary transformation. What had once been a community of farmers—what had been fields, small houses and an occasional burial ground—saw its very soil removed; nine meters into the ground, architects dug out the hill to insert hefty stone foundations, and next to what had been a modest development, they erected a temple that dwarfed not only monuments in the valley below, but monuments all around the Italic peninsula.[824] This kind of change, dramatic for its visual impact and for its speed, marked much of the archaic period and defined a new cityscape for Rome (Fig. 5.1). Below the Capitoline, a valley that was often rendered useless by flood was from the beginning of the archaic period made into a vast plain, ripe for construction. The creation of the Forum and erection of so many monuments there transformed Rome's physical make up: now instead of divided communities spanning the hills, looking to the north, the east and the south, people living at Rome were connected through a civic arena dedicated to cult and community. And the change was not confined to these spaces. Evidence for temples and houses on the Palatine and for religious and sepulchral architecture on the Velia, Esquiline, and Quirinal suggests that this changed city spread far across the hills. The

[824] On the earlier architecture of the Capitoline: I. Baroni 2001, 291-298; P. Boccuccia 2001, 299-306; F. Lugli and C. Rosa 2001, 280-290.

contrast with the previous environment must have been striking to visitors, and it must have irrevocably changed how Romans saw themselves and their community.

The creation of the Forum and monumentalization of the city around it had ramifications that stretch far beyond the scope of this dissertation, but one of its effects deserves mention. When Romans laid the landfill behind the embankment wall, the physical effort may have been confined to the reclaimed area, but the outcome of that effort was not. Since the Forum valley was nestled between hills and a riverbed, the alteration changed the landscape of the entire city. Where once nature had provided a gradual incline from riverbank to hilltop, Romans imposed a hard boundary at the edge of the landfill, creating three distinct levels to their city: the low riverside valley, the Forum plain, and the hills. Already by the end of the archaic period, evidence from the hills suggests lavish domestic and sacred architecture, and the Forum boasted four sites that would remain critical sacro-political sites: the Comitium/Curia complex, the Regia/Atrium Vestae complex, the Temple of Castor and the sacred area of Saturn. Effectively, the Forum was the center of politics, law and religion, cornerstones of elite Roman life. Below the embankment there is evidence only for manufacturing, trade and port activity. Though a lack of evidence from the archaic period renders it difficult to assert that these were the only businesses conducted in the area, there is no reason to believe otherwise, and these would remain the chief occupations of those working in the valley.

Already by the late archaic period, Romans had erected the Temple of Castor on the Forum with its back to the Velabrum, accentuating the divisions between the spaces. Contemporaneously or soon thereafter (surely by ca. 400) a Temple to Saturn echoed the Castor Temple's disposition with its back to the Velabrum, further highlighting the Forum's distinction from the lower area. By the fourth century, elite houses filled the space between the Temples of Castor and Saturn, blocking one's view of the Forum entirely. The topographical separation that the embankment wall had imposed, the monuments soon underscored. I do not suggest that Romans intentionally raised the Forum and erected the embankment wall to create new districts; instead, I believe that as Romans decided how to use this new space, the boundary grew from a topographical one to a socio-political one.[825] Perhaps it was for practical reasons that the civic separation occurred: the Forum was safe from flood—a less treacherous place for important offices than the low riverbank—and was between the hills, a neutral (or at least practicable) site for communal organization. Or, perhaps it was by chance. At present, this remains unclear, but the outcome is not: the topographical distinction lead to a civic and socio-political division that would characterize the city and its community throughout the Republic and even into the Empire. It would also play into class struggles and politics as plebeians fought to gain access to the very institutions housed in the Forum and Patrician officials vying for magistracies played to non-elites votes by offering to monumentalize the Velabrum and Forum Boarium.

[825] I owe great thanks to Penelope Davies for bringing this to my attention.

The swift and monumental changes to Rome's topography that occurred throughout the archaic period and endured to effect the Republican city are striking, but the enduring effects of archaic architecture in Rome are not confined to scale and topographical composition; they are also visible in the details of each building's style and design. Throughout this study I have highlighted foreign aspects of the city's architecture; I have stressed influences from Ionia, Cyprus, Attica and Sicily, but this is not to say that Rome was a foreign city. Just as I suggest Rome's interest in the outside world, I uphold that its architecture was locally produced, locally commissioned and demonstrates Romans' dogged maintenance of building types for traditional, local needs. Styles, forms, materials and interests distinct to Rome and its neighbors are at the core of these buildings. Most were manufactured with mud brick, pisé, local tuff and terracotta, and while the image that these materials create would be out of place in much of the Mediterranean, it would be at home in Central Italy. Formal elements like raised podia, low-pitched roofs, full-bodied antefixes, frontal access and local moulding styles feature in both religious and civic buildings in archaic Rome. For a stranger to Central Italy, these aspects of the cityscape would define it as indigenous, part of a Central Italic culture that prospered in the archaic period from Satricum to Marzabotto. It was part of a culture as different from that of Sicily, Cyprus, Attica and Ionia as those cultures were from one another.

Yet to exclude the foreign elements of the monuments of archaic Rome is to dismiss an aspect of their manufacture that is both fundamental to their design and to appreciating Rome's place in the archaic world. It was no more isolated from an archaic

Mediterranean *koine* than were Samos, Agrigento and Caere, and it was no less a participant in its perpetuation. Both locally and internationally Rome spurred a cycle of artistic distribution in the Mediterranean landscape.

Scholars have long argued that archaic Rome was a thoroughly Italic culture, one not reliant on the (primarily Greek) East for culture and art, but instead steeped in its own tradition, improved from within, independent of outside assistance. This dissertation paints an image of archaic Rome that does not allow for such a reading; it indicates a city profoundly connected to and interested in the world outside of Italy. Yet it does *not* suggest a city *dependent* on foreign influence; instead, it suggests one that has the power and interest to exploit these distant cultures. Artistic patronage is not a unidirectional process.[826] Rome would not be the beneficiary of profound tectonic education in the Capitoline, rich sculptural commission at S. Omobono and the Esquiline or changes in architectural design that look perhaps as far as Ionia had they not some gift, some power or influence to return to the workers, architects, craftsmen and others who helped build and design these monuments and their sculpture. The reclamation of the Forum, rich votives at S. Omobono, the enormity of the materials and workforce required for the Capitoline reveal a city controlling a prosperous trade on the Tiber and exploiting that traffic as well as the residual power that its economy allowed. Rome in the archaic period was not reliant on foreign artists for its culture; rather it was a powerful state capable of creating (or having others create) impressive and artistically

[826] For example: C. Renfrew 1986, 3-4, 6.

avant-gardes monuments, and its inhabitants chose to exert their means to create a city that piece by piece, over time, by the middle of the fifth century would be one of the most resplendent on the Tyrrhenian coast.

To this end, the international connections visible in archaic Rome's architecture may help clarify who exactly "Romans" were in this period. In this dissertation I have highlighted foreign influences in Rome's art and architecture, but this is not to say that Rome was otherwise occupied by a fully indigenous population, and as the city's image became more international, it only makes sense that its population would. The initial appearance of a Cypriot costume on the image of Hercules at S. Omobono or of Ionic temple architecture in the Capitoline represent fairly clear examples of artistic trends that are new (or visible for the first time) in Central Italy. In these cases, it seems clear that there is a new kind of contact with the eastern Mediterranean. This is not to say, though, that people from that region did not live in Rome before those structures were commissioned, but it does suggest a new level of contact. What is more, given that the Hercules dates to 580, but the Capitoline some seventy-five years later, one can imagine that foreign merchants, craftsmen, architects and others continued coming to Rome's shores over time. At the start of the sixth century, their contributions (at S. Omobono, in the Campanian sculptures at the Regia, and elsewhere) reveal a slight internationalization of the city's image. Thereafter, one can imagine that a symbiosis between merchants and craftsmen settling in Rome and increasing international trade led to the embellishment of an international cityscape: intercultural commissions led to

foreign inhabitants, which led to more intercultural interaction and commissions. Thus, while the interest or ability to use foreign styles and ideas in the Rome was minimal at first, by the end of the sixth century several monumental temples reveal intercultural connections, and Romans (by now surely a somewhat culturally mixed community) looked to the eastern Mediterranean for the anthemion frieze and the design of their most prominent sanctuary, and one of the most remarkable buildings in the region.

It remains unclear just who was ordering and paying for these increasingly grand buildings and infrastructural changes. Ancient sources are explicit that those responsible were Rome's kings and after the overthrow of the monarchy in 509, the early magistrates of the Republic were behind the continued monumentalization of the cityscape. Archaeological remains provide no reason to believe otherwise. Still, a cautious reading of the material record reveals no evidence that points to a kingship or even one person in charge of long periods of construction and rebuilding. An oligarchic system (or even an elected body) could just as easily have been responsible for the topographical transformation.[827] The evidence can lead to both conclusions.

Whoever was ruling the city and creating its image, this Rome is in stark contrast even to the great Rome of the Tarquins that Livy, Dionysius, Cicero and others speak of. It is more wealthy and prodigious. It is also out of place in the standard story of the development of a Roman urban image and its architectural components. Scholars

[827] Clemente Marconi has recently suggested that vast architectural change can occur in the absence of the tyranny and despotism associated with regal and oligarchic government: C. Marconi 2007, esp. 31-33

usually address Rome's connection with Greek and other non-Italic communities when they discuss third- and second-century buildings, like the Temple of Victoria and its stone architraves, the Temple to Juno Sospita in the Forum Holitorium and its peripteral design or the Temple of Jupiter Stator and its marble revetment.[828] Rome's re-emerging power, political and military expansion throughout Italy and the cultural and economic windfall that came with victory in the Punic wars lead the Roman poet Horace to famously characterize these centuries saying that "when Greece was captured, it took the fierce victor captive and brought the arts into rustic Latium."[829] But the temples at S. Omobono and the Temple of Capitoline Jupiter suggest that a profound cultural and artistic dialogue between Rome and foreign lands began much earlier. In this light, it is unfair to say, as Horace does, that Republican Rome had been a backwoods and was subservient to Greek enlightenment; Romans had long before connected to Greeks and others outside the peninsula, and already in the archaic period they enacted a monumental transformation of their city. Instead of remaining isolated and unsophisticated until the middle Republic one might see the artistic and cultural dialogue between Rome and the outside world, especially Greek communities, as episodic: more profound and evident during different periods (Archaic, mid-Republican, Augustan,

[828] on the Temple of Victoria: P. J. E. Davies 2009; on the Temple of Juno Sospita: A. Viscogliosi 1996; on Jupiter Stator: F. Coarelli 1996.
[829] Hor. *Epis.* 2.1; for discourse on the effects of the Punic wars on Roman art and architecture, esp. P. Zanker 1976.

Hadrianic, etc.).[830] This is not to say that Rome was periodically unable to solicit foreign art or that it was closed commercially to the east, but rather that as trends rose and fell, so the artistic and cultural interests of Rome ebbed and flowed.[831] The temples and votives at S. Omobono are strong evidence for this. In the first two temples, a mix of foreign and local culture and artistry is clear. Evidence for the twin temples suggests, however, that Romans were looking more to neighboring sanctuaries at Tarquinia and Ardea, perhaps indicating that Rome had turned its gaze inward to the surrounding region at the start of the Republic.

The transformation of the cityscape during the archaic period reveals that Rome was, by the start of the Republic, a powerful player in Mediterranean culture, but the new architecture not only changed Rome for its contemporaries, it also established many of the most fundamental aspects of the Eternal City's landscape. Whether foreseen or not, the Forum reclamation led to the establishment of Rome's civic and religious heart at the base of the Capitoline and Palatine, dictating the city's urban image until the late first millennium CE. The Capitoline temple sparked a dramatic change in religious architecture that can be traced through the early Republican temples of Castor, Mater Matuta and Fortuna, to Largo Argentina and the temples of the middle Republic, to

[830] Other scholars have noted literary and archaeological evidence for this, but generally pass quickly over architecture. E.g. T. P. Wiseman 1994; A. Wallace-Hadrill 2008, 25 with references; T. P. Wiseman 2008, 1-23, 271-292.

[831] Wallace-Hadrill suggests one should not see Rome as going through cycles of openness, but he seems specifically to be arguing in regard to Rome's *ability* to connect with foreigners, not in its varying interest in the outside world: A. Wallace-Hadrill 2008, 25-26.

Victoria, Portunus, and even Venus Genetrix, Mars Ultor and the marble temples of the Empire. Monumental and influential architecture did not first appear in Rome in the third century with concrete or a new wave of Hellenistic interest; these aspects of construction certainly transformed Roman construction and design, but they did not birth it. The history of Rome's architecture and urban landscape stretches back past Augustus, Sulla, the Aemilii and the Claudii, past the fourth century and the start of the Republic; before the popular Republican and Imperial projects of Roman architectural history, in the monumental architecture of the archaic period, Romans set the foundations and the standard for the city's future building programs.

# Figures

Figures (pp. 288-443) intentionally removed by author for copyright concerns.

See acknowledgments and contact author for a full copy with images.

# Appendix

## The date of the Cloaca Maxima

In the course of studying monuments from the Forum, it became necessary to determine a precise date for remains of the Cloaca Maxima. Scholars have long held that at least some portion of it was archaic and would therefore deserve inclusion in this study, but recent scholarship has suggested that the earliest remains do not date before the middle Republic. Whatever the date of the remains currently visible under the Forum, some manner of canalization of the Forum streams must have accompanied the Forum landfill project, otherwise the landfill would become inundated, unstable and would have breached the embankment.[832] The form and materials used in that original canal are at present unknown, but it is the purpose of this appendix to suggest at the very least, how long an alternative means of canalization lasted before the extant stone Cloaca was built.

No portion of the Cloaca has undergone stratigraphic excavation, so a direct correspondence with the levels of the Forum around it is still unclear; nevertheless, measurements taken from within the Cloaca and calibrated against known elevations outside of the drain suggest a height of the oldest known walls. By comparing this elevation with known elevations of the Forum pavements, one can gain a sense of which pavement the old Cloaca Maxima accompanied.

[832] See Chapter 2.

The oldest walls yet found inside the Cloaca comprise a straight tract that begins just west of the Via Sacra and ends at the eastern façade of the Basilica Julia. Here, for approximately ninety meters one finds walls of four and five courses of neatly dressed cappellaccio stone in blocks stacked directly on top of one another (Fig. 6.1).[833] The mean height of each block is 27 cm, the mean depth 55 cm and the mean length 85 cm.[834] Atop the cappellaccio walls is a latter addition of opus incertum and an un-faced concrete vault. The opus incertum is forty cm tall and the radius of the vault adds another forty cm to the height of the interior of the conduit; the concrete additions do not date before the third century and in fact probably belongs to a late Republican repair.[835] The height of the tallest remaining walls of the cappellaccio Cloaca (five courses, excluding all concrete additions) is approximately 1.36 m.

The elevation of the Vicus Tuscus, just south of the Cloaca Maxima as it passes the Basilica Julia, is 12.3 masl. The grate beneath the modern entrance to the Cloaca

[833] Bauer and Ashby both note this tract; recent observations confirm their statements: Ashby 1901, 136-138; Bauer 1989, 48-49.

[834] Measurements taken on April 4, 2008. In measuring 20 blocks. 1 was 25 cm tall, 7 were 26 cm tall, 8 were 27 cm tall, 3 were 28 cm tall and 1 was 29 cm tall. I was only able to measure the width of three blocks as there are only three openings in the north wall of the Cloaca. These were all 55 cm wide. I measured the length of 20 blocks as well; 8 were 84 cm 9 were 85 cm and 3 were 86 cm. No exact module was found.

[835] Though it is beyond the scope of this study, brief mention should be given to Carafa and Giuliani's studies that suggest the cappellaccio Cloaca postdates the Forum Galleries. Both authors look to Carettoni's exploration of the galleries, which state that the Cloaca cuts the galleries; they conclude that it must therefore postdate the Galleries, themselves built in the mid to late Republic: C. F. Giuliani and P. Verduchi 1987, 58; P. Carafa 1996, 10. Yet the study of the Galleries makes it clear that the vault of the Cloaca only just cuts them (G. Carettoni 1956-1958, 38-39); given that the interior height of the later concrete additions (the walls in opus incertum and vault in unfaced concrete) is 80 cm and the thickness of the vault would be no less than 20 cm, the cappellaccio walls are at least a meter below the galleries, and therefore the old walls *do not* cut them. The cappellaccio walls do not necessarily post date the galleries.

under the Basilica Julia is 1.49 m below the Vicus Tuscus, or 10.81 masl (Fig. 6.2-6.3).[836] The floor of the Cloaca at that point is another 1.98 m below this grate, or 8.83 masl (Fig. 6.4).[837] At this point the Cloaca is walled in Grotta Oscura, but the floor of the Cloaca maintains a constant correspondence with the walls back to the position where the Grotta Oscura walls meet the cappellaccio walls at the east face of the Basilica Julia.[838] This is evident in a comparison of the seam between the second and third course of Grotta Oscura to the meter stick (resting on the floor of the Cloaca) in both places (Figs. 6.4-6.5). Given the height of the five-course cappellaccio walls as 1.36 m and the elevation of the floor as 8.81 masl, the top of the oldest known section of the Cloaca Maxima is ca. 10.18 masl.[839]

It therefore remains to determine how this elevation corresponds to dates for construction in the Forum. Gjerstad records that the second stone pavement of the Forum as measured at the "Equus Domitiani" is 10.16 masl at its highest.[840] These excavations are just twenty meters from the cappellaccio Cloaca; the extremely close correspondence of the elevation of this pavement with the top of the cappellaccio walls suggests that the oldest Cloaca should be associated with this pavement of the Forum. Without a full excavation, though, this cannot be certain; the Cloaca could have had

[836] Measurement taken on April 16, 2008.
[837] Measurement taken on April 4, 2008.
[838] H. Bauer 1989, 50.
[839] these measurements do not account for a gradient in the Cloaca, which surely exists; however, the distance between the points of measure is just 30 meters. Even with a steep gradient, the change in elevation would be just 10-15 cm. This would make the elevation of the Cloaca in the cappellaccio area only slightly higher, which does not effect the outcome of this argument.
[840] E. Gjerstad 1953-1973, II.33.

another course of stone, though this would make for an exceptionally deep and narrow canal. Whatever the possible maximum height of the Cloaca, it is evident that the remains cannot date before the second Forum Paving; if they did, the top of the canal would have been more than 30 cm above the pavement of the Forum, considerably hindering cart traffic and other kinds of movement across the Forum. The second pavement of the Forum has been dated between ca. 450 and 400, and the oldest known portion of the Cloaca should also date to that period or later.[841]

[841] E. Gjerstad 1953-1973, II.33. Gjerstad dates the pavement much later, but this is based on his adjusted chronology. Based on finds in the strata above and below, it should not date before ca. 450 or after ca. 400. On a reanalysis of Gjerstad's dating, see Chapter 1.

## Works Cited


Adam, J. P. 1984. *La construction romaine: materiaux et techniques*, Paris.

Adamesteanu, D., D. Mertens and F. D'Andria. 1975. *Metaponto I. NSc suppl. 29*, Roma.

Adornato, G. 2003. "L'area sacra di S. Omobono: per una revisione della documentazione archeologica." *MEFRA*, 115.2: 809-835.

Åkerström, Å. 1954. "Untersuchungen über die figürlichen Terrakottenfriese aus Etruria und Latium." *OpRom*, 1: 191-231.

———. 1966. *Die Architektonischen Terrakotten Kleinasiens*, Lund.

Albertoni, M. 1983. "5a. La necropoli Esquilina arcaica e repubblicana." In Quilici, L. and G. Pisani Sartorio (eds.), *L' Archeologia in Roma capitale tra sterro e scavo*. Vicenza: 140-155.

Albertoni, M. and I. Damiani. 2008. *Il tempio di Giove e le origini del Colle Capitolino*, Milano.

Aldrete, G. S. 2007. *Floods of the Tiber in Ancient Rome*, Baltimore.

Alföldi, A. 1965. *Early Rome and the Latins*, Ann Arbor.

Alvarez, W.*, et al.* 1996. "Quaternary fluvial-volcanic stratigraphy and geochronology of the Capitoline Hill in Rome." *Geology*, 24.8: 751-754.

Alzinger, W. 1982. "Tuscanicae Dipositiones und griechische Tektonik." In Kenner, H.*, et al.* (eds.), *Pro arte antiqua: Festschrift für Hedwig Kenner*. Wien: 23-27.

Ambrosini, L. 2004. "Il bucchero nell'Agro Falisco. Un'analisi preliminare"." In Naso, A. (ed.) *Appunti sul bucchero: atti delle giornate di studio*. Firenze: 225-258.

Ammerman, A. J. 1990a. "On the Origins of the Forum Romanum." *AJA*, 94: 627-645.

———. 1990b. "Morfologia ed ambiente dell'area del Foro Romano." *Archeologia Laziale*, 10: 13-16.

———. 1996a. "The Comitium in Rome from the Beginning." *AJA*, 100: 121-136.

———. 1996b. "Dawn of the Eternal City." *The Sciences*, 29.4: 22-28.

———. 1998. "Environmental Archaeology in the Velabrum, Rome." *JRA*, 11: 213-223.

———. 1999. "Palatium (Environmental Setting)." In Steinby, E. M. (ed.) *Lexicon Topographicum Urbis Romae*, IV: 12-14.

———. 2000. "Coring Ancient Rome." *Archaeology*, 53.6: 78-82.

———. 2006. "Adding time to Rome's imago." In Haselberger, L. and J. H. Humphrey (eds.), *Imaging ancient Rome: documentation, visualization, imagination: proceedings of the Third Williams Symposium on Classical Architecture. Journal of Roman Archaeology, Supplement* Portsmouth, R.I.: 297-308.

———. 2006. "Rethinking the Banks of the Tiber in Early Rome." Presented at *The Romans and Water: Management, Technology, Culture*, conference held at The Center for the Ancient Mediterranean, Columbia University on Sept. 22-23, 2006.

———. 2009. "Environment." In Scott, R. T. (ed.) *Excavations in the Area Sacra of Vesta (1987-1996).* Ann Arbor:

Ammerman, A. J., A. Carandini and P. Brocato. 1992. "Palatino. Pendici settentrionali." *BA*, 16-18: 107-138.

Ammerman, A. J. and D. Filippi. 2004. "Dal Tevere al Argelito." *BCom*, 105: 7-28.

Ammerman, A. J.*, et al.* 2008. "The clay beds in the Velabrum and the earliest tiles in Rome." *JRA*, 21: 7-30.

Ammerman, A. J. and N. Terrenato. 1996. "Nuove osservazioni sul Colle Capitolino." *BCom*, 97: 35-46.

Ampolo, C. 1973. "Cinerario di marmo greco." In AA.VV. (ed.) *Roma medio repubblicana. Aspetti culturali di Roma e del Lazio nei secoli IV e III a.C.* Roma: 196-197.

———. 1981. "il gruppo acroteriale di S. Omobono." *PP*, 36: 32-35.

———. 1984. "Il Lusso Funerario e la Città Arcaica." *Annali. Sezione di archeologia e storia antica*, 6: 71-102.

Andrén, A. 1940. *Architectural Terracottas from Etrusco-Italic Temples*, Lund.

Antonaccio, C. 1992. "Terraces, Tombs and the Early Argive Heraion." *Hesperia*, 61.1: 85-105.

Arata, F. P. 1990. "Terrecotte architettoniche." In Cristofani, M. (ed.) *La Grande Roma dei Tarquini: Roma, Palazzo delle esposizioni, 12 giugno-30 settembre 1990: catalogo della mostra.* Roma: 119-129.

Arvanitis, N. 2004. "La Casa delle Vestali d'età Arcaica." *Workshop di Archeologia Classica*, 1: 145-153.

Ashby, T. 1899. "Recent Excavations in Rome." *ClR*, 13.9: 464-467.

———. 1901. "Recent Excavations in Rome, Basilica Julia, Basilica Aemilia, Cloaca Maxima " *ClR*, 15: 136-138.

"Athena." 2004. *Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae*, 1-2: 994-1006.

Bacon, F. H.*, et al.* 1902. *Investigations at Assos: Drawings and Photographs of the Buildings and Objects Discovered during the Excavations of 1881--1882--1883*, Cambridge, Mass.

Baglione, M. P. 1986. "I Falisci e il Tevere." *Il Tevere e le altre vie d'acqua del Lazio antico: Archeologia Laziale*, 7.2: 124-142.

Barbato, C. 2003. "Resti della Necropoli Esquilina sotto la Chiesa di S. Eusebio." *Bollettino della Unione Storia ed Arte*, 7: 45-50.

Barbera, M. 2005. "Ritrovamenti archeologici in piazza Vittorio Emanuele II. 2. La Necropoli." *BCom*, 106: 305-317.

Barker, G. and T. Rasmussen. 1998. *The Etruscans*, Oxford.

Barletta, B. A. 1983. *Ionic Influence in Archaic Sicily: The Monumental Art*, Gothenburg.

———. 1993. "Some Ionic Architectural Elements from Selinus in the Getty Museum." *Studia varia from the J. Paul Getty Museum*, I: 55-65.

———. 2000. "Ionic Influence in Western Greek Architecture. Towards a Defnition and Explanation." In Krinzinger, F. (ed.) *Die Ägäis und das westliche Mittelmeer. Beziehung und Wechselwirkungen 8 bis 5. Jhdt. v. Chr.* Wien: 203-216.

Baroni, I. 2001. "Livelli di occupazione dell'età del Bronzo nel Giardino Romano: il Bronzo recente." *BCom*, 102: 291-298.

Barthes, R. 1977. "The Death of the Author." In Heath, S. (ed.) *Image, music, text.* New York: 253-257.

Bartoloni, G. 1986. "I Latini e il Tevere." *Il Tevere e le altre vie d'acqua del Lazio antico: Archeologia Laziale*, 7.2: 98-110.

Bauer, H. 1989. "Die Cloaca Maxima in Rom." In Garbrecht, G. (ed.) *Mitteilungen - Leichtweiss-Institut für Wasserbau der Technischen Universität Braunschweig.* Braunschweig: 45-67.

Bayet, J. 1969. *Histoire politique et psychologique de la religion romaine*, Paris.

Beard, M. 2007. *The Roman Triumph*, Cambridge, Mass.

Beaufort, J.*, et al.* 1982. *Satricum: una città latina*, Firenze.

Belardelli, C. and A. M. Bietti Sestieri. 1986. "Preistoria e protostoria nel territorio di Roma: modelli di insediamento e vie di comunicazione." *Il Tevere e le altre vie d'acqua del Lazio antico: Archeologia Laziale*, 7.2: 63-69.

Beyer, I. 1974. "Die Reliefsgiebel des alten Athena Tempels der Akropolis." *AA*, 4: 640-650.

Biswas, A. K. 1970. *History of Hydrology*, Amsterdam.

Bloch, R. 1961. "Le départ des Étrusques de Rome et la dédace du Temple de Jupiter Capitolin." *CRAI*: 62-70.

Boardman, J. 1972. "Herakles, Peisistratos, and Sons." *Revue Archéologique*, 1: 57-70.

Boccuccia, P. 2001. "Livelli di occupazione dell'età del Bronzo nel giardino Romano: il Bronzo finale." *BCom*, 102: 299-306.

Boethius, A. 1967. "Nota sul Tempio Capitolino e su Vitruvio II.3.5." *Arctos*, 5: 45-49.

Boëthius, A., R. Ling and T. Rasmussen. 1994. *Etruscan and Early Roman Architecture*, New Haven.

Boitani, F. and M. Torelli. 1999. "Un nuovo santuario dell'emporion di Gravisca." In Vallet, G. (ed.) *La colonisation grecque en Méditerranée occidentale. Actes de la rencontre scientifique en hommage à Georges Vallet (Rome - Naples 15-18 novembre 1995).* Rome: 93-101.

Bonfante, L. and V. Karageorghis (eds.) 2001. *Italy and Cyprus in antiquity, 1500-450 BC: proceedings of an international symposium held at the Italian Academy for Advanced Studies in America at Columbia University, November 16-18 2000*, Nicosia.

Bonghi Jovino, M. 1997. "La phase archaïque de l'Ara della Regina à la lumière des recherches récentes." In Gaultier, F. and D. Briquel (eds.), *Les plus religieux des hommes. Etat de la recherche sur la religion étrusque. Actes du colloque international, 17 - 19 novembre 1992.* Paris: 69-95.

———. 1999. "Tantum ratio sacrorum gerebatur. L'edificio beta di Tarquinia in epoca orientalizzante e ata-arcaica." In Castoldi, M. (ed.) *Koina. Miscellanea di studi archeologici in onore di Piero Orlandini*. Milan: 87-103.

Boni, G. 1900. "Esplorazioni nel Comizio." *NSc*: 295-340.

———. 1903. "Sepolcreto del Septimontium preromuleo." *NSc*: 123-170.

Borda, M. 1946-1947. "'Kypros Charaktér' Aspetti della scultura arcaica cipriota." *RendPontAc*, 22: 87-154.

Brendel, O. 1953. "Prolegomena to a Book on Roman Art." *MemAmAc*, 21: 7, 9-73.

Briant, P. 2001. *Irrigation et drainage dans l'antiquité: qanats et canalisations souterraines en Iran, en Égypte et en Grèce : séminaire tenu au Collège de France*, Paris.

Brilliant, R. 1984. *Visual Narratives: Storytelling in Etruscan and Roman Art*, Ithaca.

———. 2007. "Forwards and backwards in the history of Roman art." *JRA*, 20: 7-24.

Brizio, E. 1889. "Relazione sugli scavi eseguiti a Marzabotto presso Bologna dal Novembre 1888 a tutto maggio 1889." *MonAnt*, 1: 250-426 & tav. I-X.

Brown, F. E. 1935. "The Regia." *MemAmAc*, 12: 67-88 & pl. 64-68.

———. 1961. *Roman Architecture*, New York.

———. 1967. "New Soundings in the Regia. The Evidence for the Early Republic." In Rieverdin, O. (ed.) *Les Origines de la République Romaine*. Vandoeuvres-Geneve 47-64.

———. 1974-5. "La Protostoria della Regia." *RendPontAc*, 47: 15-36.

Bruun, C. 1993. "Herakles and the Tyrants: An Archaic Frieze from Velletri." In Rystedt, E., C. Wikander and Ö. Wikander (eds.), *Deliciae fictiles: proceedings of the first International Conference on Central Italic Architectural Terracottas at the Swedish Institute in Rome, 10-12 December 1990*. Stockholm: 267-275.

Buschor, E. 1930. "Heraion von Samos: Frühe Bauten." *AM*, 55: 1-162.

Camp, J. M. and W. B. Dinsmoor. 1984. *Ancient Athenian Building Methods*, Athens.

Carafa, P. 1995. *Officine ceramiche di età regia: produzione di ceramica in impasto a Roma dalla fine dell'8. alla fine del 6. secolo a.C*, Roma.

———. 1996. "La 'Grande Roma dei Tarquini' e la città romulea-numana." *BCom*, 97: 7-34.

———. 1997. "La Cronologia dei contesti. L'età orientalizzante e arcaica." In Carandini, A. (ed.) *La Nascita di Roma. Dèi, Lari, Eroi e Uomini all'Alba di una Civilità*. Torino: 599-601.

———. 1998. *Il Comizio di Roma dalle origini all'età di Augusto*, Roma.

———. 2000. "I contesti archeologici dell'età Romulea e della Prima età regia." In Carandini, A. (ed.) *Roma: Romolo, Remo e la fondazione della città*. Milano: 68-73.

Carandini, A. 1986. "Pendici settentrionale del Palatino." *BCom*, 91: 429-438.

———. 1990. "Palatino, pendici settentrionali. Compagne de scafo 1985-1988." *BA*, 2: 159-165.

———. 2004. *Palatino, Velia e Sacra via: paesaggi urbani attraverso il tempo*, Roma.

Carandini, A. and R. Cappelli (eds.) 2000. *Roma: Romolo, Remo e la fondazione della città*, Milano.

Carandini, A., P. Carafa and e. al. 1995 [2000]. *Palatium e Sacra Via I. Prima delle mura, l'età delle mura e l'età case arcaiche*, Roma.

Carandini, A., M. T. D'Alessio and H. Di Giuseppe. 2006. *La fattoria e la villa dell'Auditorium nel quartiere Flaminio di Roma*, Roma.

Carettoni, G. 1948. "Basilica Emilia." *NSc*: 111-118.

———. 1956-1958. "Le Gallerie Ipogee del Foro Romano e i Ludi gladiatori forensi." *Estratto dal Volume 76 del Bullettino della Commissione archeologica di Roma*, 76: 23-44 + 24 plates.

———. 1961. "Esplorazione sotto la Basilica Giulia al foro Romano." *RendLink*, 16: 53-60.

Carlucci, C. 2001. "Portonaccio. Il Tempio. Le statue acroteriali e le loro sottobasi." In Moretti Sgubini, A. M. (ed.) *Veio, Cerveteri, Vulci. Città d'Etruria a confronto*. Roma: 57-61.

Castagnoli, F. 1955. "Peripteros sine postico." *RM*, 62: 139-145.

———. 1959-1960. "Sulla tipologia degli altari di lavinio." *BCom*, 77: 145-172 & tav. 141-142.

———. 1966-1967. "Sul tempio 'Italico'." *RM*, 73-74: 10-14.

———. 1973-1974. "Topografia romana e tradizione storiografica su roma arcaica." *ArchCl*, 35-36: 123-131.

———. 1974. "Topografia e urbanistica di Roma nel IV secolo a.C." *StRom*, 22: 425-443.

———. 1979. "Il culto della mater matuta e della fortuna nel foro boario." *StRom*, 27.2: 145-152.

———. 1984. "Il tempio romano. Questioni di terminologia e di tipologia." *BSR*, 52: 3-20.

Cazzella, A. 2001. "Sviluppi verso l'urbanizzazione a Roma alla luce dei recenti scavi nel Giardino Romano." *BCom*, 102: 265-268.

Chiarucci, P. and T. Gizi. 1985. *Area sacra di Satricum: tra scavo e restituzione. catalogo della mostra, Museo Civico Albano, 20 aprile - 2 giugno 1985*, Roma.

Ciancio Rossetto, P. 1985. "Circo Massimo." In Bietti Sestieri, A. M. (ed.) *Roma, archeologia nel centro, 1. L'area archeologica centrale. 2. La città murata.* Roma: 214-223.

———. 1986. "Circo Massimo. Primi risultati delle indagini geognostiche." *Archeologia Laziale*, 7: 127-134.

———. 1998. "Tempio di Apollo: Nuove indagini sulla fase repubblicana." *RendPontAc*, 70: 177-195.

Cifani, G. 1994. "Aspetti dell'edilizia romana arcaica." *StEtr*, 60: 185-226.

———. 1997. "Le Origini dell'architettura in pietra a Roma." In Brandt, J. R.*, et al.* (eds.), *From Huts to Houses: Transforamtions of Ancient Societies.* Stockholm: 55-61.

———. 2008. *Architettura Romana Arcaica: Edilizia e società tra Monarchia e Repubblica*, Roma.

Claridge, A. 1998. *Rome: An Oxford Archaeological Guide*, New York.

———. 2007. "Hadrian's Lost Temple of Trajan." *JRA*, 20: 54-94.

Coarelli, F. 1974. *Guida Archeologica di Roma*, Milano.

———. 1977. "Il Comizio dalle origini alla fine della Repubblica." *PP*: 166-238.

———. 1981. "Sull'area sacra di S. Omobono." *PP*, 36: 35-38.

———. 1983. *Il Foro Romano*, Roma.

———. 1988a. *Il Foro Boario: dalle origini alla fine della Repubblica*, Roma.

———. 1988b. "I santuari, il fiume, gli emporia." In Momigliano, A. and A. Schiavone (eds.), *Storia di Roma: I, Roma in Italia.* Torino: 127-151.

———. 1991. "Gli emissari dei laghi laziali tra mito e storia." In Bergamini, M. (ed.) *Gli Etruschi maestri di idraulica.* Perugia: 35-41.

———. 1995. "Comitium." In Steinby, E. M. (ed.) *Lexicon Topographicum Urbis Romae*, II: 309-314.

———. 1996. "Iuno Sospita (in Foro Holitorio), Aedes." In Steinby, E. M. (ed.) *Lexicon Topographicum Urbis Romae*, III: 128-129.

———. 1999. "Sacra Via." In Steinby, E. M. (ed.) *Lexicon Topographicum Urbis Romae*, IV: 223-228.

Coarelli, F., A. Rossi and R. Schezen. 1980. *Templi dell'Italia Antica*, Milano.

Colini, A. M. 1938. "Zona dei Fori Olitori e Boario: tra la via del Mare e la Piazza della Consolazione." *BCom*, 66: 279-282.

———. 1959-1960. "Introduzione allo studio dell'area sacra di S. Omobono." *BCom*, 77: 3-6.

———. 1965. "Il Colle Capitolino nell'antichità." *Capitolium*, 40: 175-185.

———. 1977. "Ambiente e storia dei tempi piú antichi." *PP*, 32: 9-19.

———. 1980. "Il porto fluviale del Foro Boario a Roma." *MemAmAc*, 36: 43-53.

Colini, A. M.*, et al.* (eds.) 2000. *Appunti degli scavi di Roma. II. Quaderni V-VI-VII-IX*, Roma.

———. 1978. "Area Sacra di S. Omobono in Roma. Ricerca stratigrafica." *Un decennio di ricerche archeologiche*, 2: 417-442.

Colonna, G. 1959-1960. "S. Omobono - la ceramica Etrusca dipinta." *BCom*, 77: 145-172 & tav. 141-148.

———. 1964. "Aspetti culturali della Roma primitiva: il periodo orientalizzante recente." *ArchCl*, 16: 1-12.

———. 1965. "Il santuario di Pyrgi alla luce delle recenti scoperte." *StEtr*, 33: 191-219.

———. 1966. "Elementi Architettonici in Pietra dal Santuario di Pyrgi." *ArchCl*, 18: 268-277.

———. 1977a. "Un tripode fittile geometrico dal Foro Romano " *MEFRA*, 89.2: 471-491.

———. 1977b. "Un aspetto oscuro del Lazio antico. Le tombe del VI-V secolo a.C." *PP*, 32: 131-165.

———. 1981a. "Tarquinio Prisco e il tempio di Giove Capitolino." *PP*, 36: 41-59.

———. 1981b. "Varrone e i più antichi templi romani, Varrone e Vulca." *PP*, 36: 51-59.

———. 1984. "I templi del Lazio fino al V secolo compreso." *Archeologia Laziale* 6: 396-411.

———. 1986. "Il Tevere e gli Etruschi." *Il Tevere e le altre vie d'acqua del Lazio antico: Archeologia Laziale*, 7.2: 90-97.

———. 1987a. "Etruria e Lazio nell'età dei Tarquini." In Cristofani, M. (ed.) *Etruria e Lazio arcaico: atti dell'incontro di studio (10-11 novembre 1986)*. Rome: 57-66.

———. 1988a. "I Latini e gli altri popoli del Lazio." In Chieco Bianchi, A. M. (ed.) *Italia omnium terrarum alumna: la civiltà dei Veneti, Reti, Liguri, Celti, Piceni, Umbri, Latini, Campani e Iapigi*. Milano: 411-531.

———. 1988b. "la produzione artigianale." In Momigliano, A. and A. Schiavone (eds.), *Storia di Roma: I, Roma in Italia*. Torino: 292-316.

———. 1991. "Le due fasi del tempio arcaico di S. Omobono." In Gnade, M. (ed.) *Stips votiva. Papers presented to C. M. Stibbe*. Amsterdam: 51-59.

———. 1996. "Roma Arcaica, I Suoi Sepolcreti e le Vie per i Colli Albani." In Pasqualini, A. (ed.) *Alba Longa. Mito storia archeologia atti dell'incontro di Studio (Roma-Albano laziale) 27-29 gennaio 1994*. Roma: 335-354.

———. 2001. "Veio. Portonaccio." In Moretti Sgubini, A. M. (ed.) *Veio, Cerveteri, Vulci. Città d'Etruria a confronto*. Roma: 37-44.

———. 2006. "Sacred Architecture and the Religion of the Etruscans." In De Grummond, N. T. and E. Simon (eds.), *The Religion of the Etruscans*. Austin: 132-168.

——— (ed.) 1985. *Santuari d'Etruria*, Milano.

Colonna, G. and M. Pallottino. 1970. *Pyrgi. Scavi del Santuario Etrusco (1959-1967). NSc Suppl. XXIV*, Roma.

Cook, J. M. and R. V. Nicholls. 1998. *Old Smyrna excavations: The Temples of Athena*, London.

Cooper, F. A. 2008. "Greek Engineering and Construction." In Oleson, J. P. (ed.) *Oxford Handbook of Engineering and Technology in the Classical World.* New York: 225-255.

Cornell, T. 1995. *The Beginnings of Rome: Italy and Rome from the Bronze Age to the Punic Wars (c. 1000-264 B.C.)*, London.

Cornell, T. J. 2000. "The City of Rome in the Middle Republic." In Coulston, J. and H. Dodge (eds.), *Ancient Rome: the archaeology of the Eternal City.* Oxford: 42-60.

Courby, F. 1931. *Les temples d'Apollon*, Paris.

Cristofani, M. 1977. "Artisti etruschi a roma." *Prospettiva: rivista di storia dell'arte antica e moderna*, 9: 2-7.

———. 1981. "Riflessioni sulla decorazione architettonica di prima fase in Etruria e a Roma." In Pallottino, M. (ed.) *Gli Etruschi e Roma: Incontro di studio in onore di Massimo Pallottino.* Rome:

———. 1981. "Sulle terracotte di S. Omobono." *PP*, 36: 31-32.

———. 1990. "architettura e produzione figurative." In Cristofani, M. (ed.) *La Grande Roma dei Tarquini: Roma, Palazzo delle esposizioni, 12 giugno-30 settembre 1990: catalogo della mostra.* Roma: 133-137.

———. 1990. "Osservazioni sulle decorazioni fittili arcaiche dal santuario di Sant'Omobono." *Archeologia Laziale*, 10: 31-37.

——— (ed.) 1990. *La Grande Roma dei Tarquini: Roma, Palazzo delle esposizioni, 12 giugno-30 settembre 1990: catalogo della mostra*, Roma.

——— (ed.) 1992. *Lo scarico arcaico della vigna parrochiale*, Roma.

Cullhed, M. 1994. *Conservator Urbis Suae: Studies in the Politics and Propaganda of the Emperor Maxentius*, Stockholm.

Damgaard Andersen, H. 1998. *Etruscan Architecture from the Late Orientalizing to the Archaic Period (c. 640-480 B.C.). V vols.* Dissertation: University of Copenhagen.

Daminato, L. 1977. "Esame preliminare dei materiali archeologici (Scavo 1974-1975): Parte I." *PP*, 32: 35-42.

Danti, A. 2001. "L'indagine archeologica nell'area del Tempio di Giove Capitolino." *BCom*, 102: 323-338.

Davies, P. J. E. 2006. "Exploring the International Arena: The Tarquins' Aspirations for the Temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus." In Mattusch, C. C., A. A. Donohue and A. Brauer (eds.), *Common Ground: Archaeology, Art, Science and Humanities: Proceedings of the XVIth International Congress of Classical Archaeology, Boston, August 23-26, 2003*. Oxford: 187-190.

———. 2009. "On the Introduction of Stone Entablatures in Republican Temples in Rome." Presented at *Annual Meeting of the Archaeological Institute of America*, conference held at Philadelphia on 1.11.2009.

———. 2009. "The Tomb of the Sempronii: identity and ideology." Presented at *9th International Conference on the Social Context of Death, Dying and Disposal*, conference held at Durham University on September 2009.

Davies, P. J. E.*, et al.* 2007. *Janson's History of Art: The Western Tradition*, Upper Saddle River, N.J.

De Franciscis, A. 1979. *Il Santuario di Marasà in Locri Epizefiri*, Napoli.

de Grummond, E. C. 2005. *Sacred Sites and Religion in Early Rome. Eighth to Sixth Centuries BC.* Dissertation: The University of Michigan.

De La Geniere, J.*, et al.* 1999. "L'Héraion du Sele. Nouvelles découvertes." *CRAI*: 501-508.

De La Geniere, J., G. Greco and R. Donnarumna. 1997. "L'Héraion de Foce del Sele, découvertes récentes." *CRAI*: 333-353.

De Puma, R. D. and J. P. Small. 1994. *Murlo and the Etruscans: Art and society in Ancient Etruria*, Madison.

De Waele, J. A. K. E. 1981. "I templi della Mater Matuta a Satricum." *MededRom*, 43: 7-68.

De Waele, J. A. K. E. and R. Cantilena. 2001. *Il tempio dorico del foro triangolare di Pompei*, Roma.

Delaine, J. 2002. "The Temple of Hadrian at Cyzicus and Roman Attitudes to Exceptional Construction." *BSR*, 70: 205-230.

Detlefsen, D. 1860. "De Comitio romano." *AdI*, 32: 128-160.

Dinsmoor, W. B. 1975. *The Architecture of Ancient Greece: An Account of its Historic Development*, New York.

Dionysius. Cary, E. (trans.), 1937. *The Roman antiquities of Dionysius of Halicarnassus*, Cambridge, Mass.

Downey, S. B. 1995. *Architectural terracottas from the Regia*, Ann Arbor.

Edlund-Berry, I. E. M. 1992. *The Seated and Standing Statue Akroteria from Poggio Civitate (Murlo)*, Roma.

———. 2008. "The Language of Etrusco-Italic Architecture: New Perspectives on Tuscan Temples." *AJA*, 112.3: 441-448.

*Enea nel Lazio, archeologia e mito: bimillenario virgiliano (mostra a Roma 22 settembre-31 dicembre 1981, Campidoglio, Palazzo dei Conservatori)*, 1981. Roma.

Ferrari, G. 1994-1995. "Heracles, Pisistratus and the Panathenaea." *Metis: Revue d'anthropologie du monde grec ancien*, 9-10: 219-226.

Feye, J. 1970. "Il Tempio G di Selinunte e l'architettura dei templi siciliani." *Bulletin Antieke Beschaving Orgaan van de Vereeniging Antieke Beschaving*, 71: 88-99.

Ficoroni, F. 1744. *Le vestigia e rarità di Roma antica*, Roma.

Filippi, D. 2004a. "La Domus Regia." *Workshop di Archeologia Classica*, 1: 101-121.

———. 2004b. "Dal Palatino al Foro Orientale: Le mura e il Santuario di Vesta." *Workshop di Archeologia Classica*, 1: 89-100.

———. 2005. "Il Velabro e le origini del Foro." *Workshop di Archeologia Classica*, 2: 93-109.

Forsythe, G. 2005. *A critical history of early Rome: from prehistory to the first Punic War*, Berkeley.

Fortunati, F. R. 1986. "Ipotesi ricostruttive della decorazione del tempio di Velletri." *Prospettiva: rivista di storia dell'arte antica e moderna*, 47: 3-11.

Fortunelli, S. 2007. *Il deposito votivo del santuario settentrionale*, Bari.

Foucault, M. 1984. "What is an Author." In Rabinow, P. (ed.) *The Foucault Reader*. New York: 101-120.

Fourrier, S. 2007. *La coroplastie chypriote archaïque: identités culturelles et politiques à l'époque des royaumes*, Lyon.

Fowler, H. N.*, et al.* 1932. *Corinth, Results of Excavations. Vol I. Introduction: topography, architecture*, Cambridge, Mass.

Galieti, A. 1928. "Il tempio Italico rinvenuto nell'acropolis di Lanuvium." *BCom*, 56: 75-118, 199-249.

Gantz, T. N. 1974. "Lapis Niger. The Tomb of Romulus." *PP*, 29: 350-361.

———. 1974. "Terracotta figured friezes from the workshop of Vucla." *OpRom*, 10.1: 1-9.

Ganzert, J. 1990. "Zweimal zur vitruv-interpretation." *OpRom*, 18: 107-114.

Garbrecht, G. 1968. "Hydraulic Engineering Prior to 600 BC." *Journal of the Hydraulics Division, American Society of Civil Engineers, New York*, 94: 612-618.

———. 1987. *Hydraulics and hydraulic research: a historical review*, Rotterdam.

Garde, R. J. 1978. "Irrigation in Ancient Mesopotamia." *International Commission on Irrigation and Drainage Bulletin*, 20: 1-17.

Gellius, A. Rolfe, J. C. (trans.), 1946. *Noctes Atticae*, Camridge, Mass.

Gilotta, F. 1990. "la ceramica di importazione." In Cristofani, M. (ed.) *La Grande Roma dei Tarquini: Roma, Palazzo delle esposizioni, 12 giugno-30 settembre 1990: catalogo della mostra.* Roma: 140-141.

Giuliani, C. F. 1982. "Architettura e tecnica edilizia." In Pensabene, P., I. Dondero and L. Campus (eds.), *Roma repubblicana fra il 509 e il 270 a.C.* Roma: 29-36.

Giuliani, C. F. and P. Verduchi. 1987. *L'area Centrale del Foro Romano*, Firenze.

Giuliano, A. 1981. "Sul frontone di S. Omobono." *PP*, 36: 35.

Gjerstad, E. 1941. "Il comizio romano dell'età repubblicana." *OpArch*, 2: 97-158.

———. 1953-1973. *Early Rome, I-VI*, Lund.

———. 1954. "The Fortifications of Early Rome." *OpRom*, 1: 50-65.

———. 1961. "Discussions concerning Early Rome [1]." *OpRom*, 3: 69-102.

———. 1965 b. "Discussions concerning Early Rome, 2." *OpRom*, 5: 1-74.

———. 1978. "The Cypro-archaic life-size terracotta statue found in old Smyrna." In Akurgal, E. (ed.) *The proceedings of the Xth International Congress of Classical Archaeology, Ankara-Izmir, 23-30/9/1973.* Ankara: 709-713, pl. 218.

Gjerstad, E.*, et al.* 1934. *The Swedish Cyprus expedition: finds and results of the excavations in Cyprus, 1927-1931*, Stockholm.

Goidanich, P. G. 1943. "Rapporti culturali e linguistici tra Roma e gli Italici: origine antica della cultura in Roma: l'iscrizione arcaica del Foro Romano e il suo ambiente archeologico: suo valore giuridico." *Atti della Reale Accademi d'Italia. Memorie della Classe di scienze morali e storiche*, 3.7: 318-501.

Gros, P. 1996. *L'architecture romaine: du début du IIIe siècle av. J.-C. à la fin du Haut-Empire*, Paris.

———. 2001. *L'architecture romaine: du début du IIIe siècle av. J.-C. à la fin du Haut-Empire*, Paris.

———. 2006. *L'architecture romaine: du début du IIIe siècle av. J.-C. à la fin du Haut-Empire*, Paris.

Gros, P. and M. Torelli. 1988. *Storia dell'urbanistica. Il mondo romano*, Bari.

Gruben, G. 1963. "Das archaische Didymaion." *JdI*, 78: 78-182.

Gusberti, E. 2005. "I reperti del Saggio Boni-Gjerstad." *Workshop di Archeologia Classica*, 2: 117-134.

Hackens, T. 1962. "À propos de la topographie du Capitole." *BBelgRom*, 34: 9-26.

Handlin, D. P. 1985. *American Architecture*, London.

Hanell, K. 1967. "Probleme der römischen Fasti." In Rieverdin, O. (ed.) *Les origines de la république romaine*. Vandoeuvres-Geneve 175-196.

Haynes, S. 2000. *Etruscan Civilization: A Cultural History*, Los Angeles.

"Herakles." 2004. *Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae*, 4-5: 2847-2938, 3087-3094.

Hodder, I. 2005. *Changing materialities at Çatalhöyük: reports from the 1995-99 seasons*, London.

Hodge, T. 1960. *The Woodwork of Greek Roofs*, Cambridge.

Hogarth, D. G.*, et al.* 1908. *The Archaic Artemisia*, London.

Holland, L. A. 1961. *Janus and the bridge*, Rome.

Holliday, P. J. 2002. *The Origins of Roman Historical Commemoration in the Visual Arts*, Cambridge.

Holloway, R. R. 1994. *The archaeology of early Rome and Latium*, London.

Hölscher, T. 1972. *Die Bedeutung archaischer Tierkampfbilder*, Würzburg.

———. 2004. *The Language of Images in Roman Art*, Cambridge.

Hopkins, J. N. N. 2007. "The Cloaca Maxima and the Monumental Manipulation of Water in Archaic Rome." *The Waters of Rome*, 4: 1-15.

Horden, P. and N. Purcell. 2000. *The Corrupting Sea: A Study of Mediterranean History*, Malden, Mass.

Hülsen, C. and J. B. Carter. 1906. *The Roman Forum, Its History and Its Monuments*, Rome.

*Il viver quotidiano in Roma arcaica: materiali degli scavi del Tempio Arcaico nell'area sacra di S. Omobono*, 1989. Rome.

Ioppolo, G. 1966. "The Forum Boarium, Sanctuary of Fortuna and Mater Matuta." In Gjerstad, E. (ed.) *Early Rome IV*. Lund: 399-400.

———. 1971-1972. "I reperti ossei animali nell'area archeologica di S. Omobono (1962-1964)." *RendPontAc*, 44: 3-46.

———. 1998. "Inediti architettonici dall'Area Sacra di S. Omobono." *RendPontAc*, 70: 167-175.

Jordan, H. 1876. "Osservazioni sul tempio di Gove Capitolino." *Bullettino degli annali dell'Istituto di Corrispondenza Archeologica*: 145-172.

———. 1885. *Topographie der Stadt Rom im Alterthum*, Berlin.

Karageorghis, V. 2003. *The Cyprus collectionss in the Medelhavsmuseet*, Nicosia.

Karageorghis, V., J. Mertens and M. Rose. 2000. *Ancient art from Cyprus: the Cesnola collection in the Metropolitan Museum of Art*, New York.

Klein, N. L. 1998. "Evidence for West Greek Influence on Mainland Greek Roof Construction and the Creation of the Truss in the Archaic Period." *Hesperia*, 67.4: 335-374.

Knoop, R. R. 1987. *Antefixa Satricana: Sixth-Century Architectural Terracottas from the Sanctuary of Mater Matuta at Satricum (Le Ferriere)*, Assen, The Netherlands.

Lambrinoudakis, V. and G. Gruben. 1987. "Das neuentdeckte Heiligtum von Iria auf Naxos." *AA*, 98: 569-621.

Lancel, S. 1979. *Byrsa*, Rome.

Lanciani, R. 1875. "Il tempio di Giove Ottimo Massimo." *BCom*, 3: 165-189.

*Lavinium*, 1972. Roma.

Lawrence, A. W. and R. A. Tomlinson. 1983. *Greek Architecture*, New York.

Lewe. 1975. *Studien zur archaischen kyprischen Plastic*. Dissertation: Johann Wolfgang Goethe-Universität.

Lugli, F. and C. Rosa. 2001. "Prime evidenze di opere di terrazzamento del Capitolium nell'età del Bronzo recente." *BCom*, 102: 280-290.

Lulof, P. S. 1993. "Reconstruction and architectural setting of large terracotta statues: the case of Satricum." In Rystedt, E., C. Wikander and Ö. Wikander (eds.), *Deliciae fictiles: proceedings of the first International Conference on Central Italic Architectural Terracottas at the Swedish Institute in Rome, 10-12 December 1990*. Stockholm: 277-286.

———. 1996. *The Ridge-Pole Statues from the Late Archaic Temple at Satricum*, Amsterdam.

———. 2000. "Archaic terracotta acroteria representing Athena and Heracles: Manifestations of power in Central Italy." *JRA*, 13: 207-219.

———. 2006. "'Roofs from the South': Campanian Architectural Terracottas in Satricum." In Edlund-Berry, I. E. M., G. Greco and J. Kenfield (eds.), *Deliciae Fictiles III: Architectural Terracottas in Ancient Italy: New Discoveries and Interpretations*, Rome: 235-242.

———. 2007. "L'Amazzone dell'Esquilino. Una nuova ricostruzione." *BCom*, 108: 1-25.

Lyngby, H. 1939. *Die tempel der Fortuna und der Mater Matuta am Forum boarium in Rom*, Berlin.

———. 1954. *Beiträge zur Topographie des Forum-Boarium-Gebietes in Rom; Testimonien nebst Kommentar und kritischem Apparat*, Lund.

MacDonald, W. L. 1982. *The Architecture of the Roman Empire*, New Haven.

Maetzke, G. 1985. "Analisi topografica e ricerche archeologiche nell'area nord-occidentale del Foro Romano." *Forma. La città antica e il suo avvenire*. Roma: 173-178.

———. 1986. "Regione VIII. Area nord-occidentale del Foro Romano." *BCom*, 87: 372-380.

———. 1989. "Continuità e trasformazioni: scavi nell'area occidentale del foro Romano." *Archeo*: 66-73.

———. 1991. "La lettura stratigrafica dell'area nord-occidentale del Foro Romano come appare dai recenti interventi di scavo." *Archeologia Medievale*, 18: 43-200.

Malkin, I. 2005. *Mediterranean paradigms and classical antiquity*, London.

Mambella, R. 1982. "Contributi alla problematica sul tempio etrusco-italico." *RdA*, 6: 35-42.

Manino, L. 1989. "Ricostruzioni ideali di una casa arcaica di tipo etrusco presso la via Sacra." *Atti del Secono Congresso Internazionale Etrusco*. Firenze: 337-340.

Manzelli, V. 1995. "Le regolarizzazioni agrarie in Crimea e nel territorio di Metaponto." In Quilici, L. and S. Quilici Gigli (eds.), *Interventi di bonifica agraria nell'Italia romana*. Roma: 229-240.

Marconi, C. 2007. *Temple Decoration and Cultural Identity in the Archaic Greek World: The Metopes of Selinus*, Cambridge.

Martinez-Pinna, J. 1980. "Evidenza di un Tempio di Giove Capitolino a Roma all'Inizio del VI sc. a.C." *Archeologia Laziale*, 4: 249-252.

Massabò, B. 1988-1989. "Il santuario etrusco di Fontanile di Legnisina a Vulci. Relazione delle campagne di scavo 1985 e 1986: il tempio." *NSc*: 103-135.

McCracken, G. 1948. "Tusculum." In Wissowa, G. (ed.) *Paulys Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft : neue Bearbeitung / unter Mitwirkung zahlreicher Fachgenossen*, VIIA2:

Melis, F. and A. Rathje. 1984. "Considerazioni sullo studio dell'architettura domestica arcaica." *Archeologia Laziale*, VI: 382-395.

Meritt, L. S. and I. E. M. Edlund-Berry. 2000. *Etruscan and Republican Roman mouldings*, Philadelphia.

Mertens, D. 1980. "Parallelismi struturali nell'architettra della Magna Grecia e dell'Italia centrale in età arcaica." In Padula, M. (ed.) *Attività archeologica in Basilicata, 1964-1977. Scritti in onore di Dinu Adamesteanu*. Matera: 37-82.

———. 1994. "Elementi di origine etrusco-campana nell'architettura della Magna Grecia." *Magna Grecia, Etruschi, Fenici: atti del trentatreesimo Convegno di studi sulla Magna Grecia: Taranto, 8-13 ottobre 1993*. Taranto: 195-209.

Mertens, D. and M. Schützenberger. 2006. *Città e monumenti dei greci d'occidente: dalla colonizzazione alla crisi di fine V secolo a.C*, Roma.

Mertens, D., M. Schützenberger and R. Sponer-Za. 1993. *Der alte Heratempel in Paestum und die archaische Baukunst in Unteritalien*, Mainz am Rhein.

Mertens-Horn, M. 1994. "Corinto e l'Occidente nelle immagini. La nascita di Pegaso e la nascita di Afrodite." In Grecia, I. p. l. s. e. l. a. d. M. (ed.) *Corinto e l'Occidente: atti del trentaquattresimo Convegno di studi sulla Magna Grecia.* Taranto: 257-289.

———. 1997. "Herakles, Leukothea e Palaimon sul tempio arcaico del Foro Boario." In Lulof, P. S. and E. M. Moormann (eds.), *Deliciae Fictiles II: Proceedings of the 2nd International Conference on Archaic Architectural Terracottas from Italy held at the Netherlands Institute in Rome 12-13 June 1996*. Amsterdam: 143-149.

Meyer, J. C. 1980. "Roman Hisotry in Light of the Import of Attic Vases to Rome and South Etruria in the 6th and 5th Centuries BC." *AnalRom*, 9: 47-68.

———. 1983. *Pre-Republican Rome : an analysis of the cultural and chronological relations, 1000-500 B.C*, Odense, Denmark.

Meyers, G. E. 2003. *Etrusco-Italic Monumental Architectural Space from the Iron Age to the Archaic Period: An Examination of Approach and Access*. Dissertation: The University of Texas

Miller, S. G. 1978. *The Prytaneion: Its Function and Architectural Form*, Berkeley.

Morel, J.-P. 1975. "L'expansion phocéenne en Occident. Dix années de recherches, 1966 - 1975." *Bulletin de correspondance hellénique* 99: 853-896.

Müller, P. 1978. *Löwen und Mischwesen in der archaischen griechischen Kunst*, Zürich.

Müller-Karpe, H. 1962. *Zur Stadtwerdung Roms*, Heidelberg.

Mura Sommella, A. 1977. "L'area sacra di S. Omobono. La decorazione architettonica del tempio arcaico." *PP*, 32: 62-128, 312.

———. 1981. "Il gruppo di eracle e athena." *PP*, 36: 59-64.

———. 1990. "Il tempio arcaico e la sua decorazione." In Cristofani, M. (ed.) *La Grande Roma dei Tarquini: Roma, Palazzo delle esposizioni, 12 giugno-30 settembre 1990: catalogo della mostra.* Roma: 115-118.

———. 1993. "Ancora sulla decorazione plastica del tempio arcaico del Foro Boario: statue e acroterie." In Rystedt, E., C. Wikander and Ö. Wikander (eds.), *Deliciae fictiles: proceedings of the first International Conference on Central Italic Architectural Terracottas at the Swedish Institute in Rome, 10-12 December 1990*. Stockholm: 225-232.

———. 1997. "*Inter Duos Lucos*: Problematiche relative alla localizzazione dell'Asylum'." In Pallottino, M. (ed.) *Etrusca et italica: scritti in ricordo di Massimo Pallottino*. Pisa: 425-442.

———. 2000a. "'La grande Roma dei Tarquini'. Alterne vicende di una felice intuizione." *BCom*, 101: 7-26.

———. 2000b. "Le recenti scoperte sul Campidoglio e la fondazione del tempio di Giove Capitolino." *RendPontAc*, 70: 57-79.

———. 2001. "Notizie preliminare sulle scoperte e sulle indagini archeologiche nel versante orientale del Capitolium." *BCom*, 102: 262-264.

———. 2002. "'La grande Roma dei Tarquini'. Alterne vicende di una felice intuizioine." In Roscetti, F., L. Lanzetta and L. Canatore (eds.), *Il classico nella Roma contemporanea. Mito, modelli, memoria. Atti del convegno Roma 18-20 ottobre 2000*. Roma: 303-323.

———. 2008. "Il Tempio di Giove Capitolino e l'architettura etrusco-italico - osservazioni su alcune terrecotte arcaiche da Roma." Presented at *Gli Etruschi e Roma. Fasi monarchica e altorepubblicana. XVI Convegno Internazionale di studi sulla storia e l'archeologia dell'Etruria*, conference held at Orvieto on 12-14 December 2008.

Neils, J. 2008. "Niobe(?) on the Portonaccio Temple." *Etruscan Studies*, 11: 35-48.

Nemirovsky, A. I. 1982. "A Greek emporium in an Etruscan port." *Vestnik drevnej istorii*, 1: 152-162.

Nielsen, E. O. and A. S. Tuck. 2001. "An Orientalizing Period Complex at Poggio Civitate (Murlo): A Preliminary View." *Etruscan Studies*, 8: 35-63.

Nielsen, I. 1990. "The Forum paving and the temple of Castor and Pollux." *AnalRom*, 19: 89-104.

Nielsen, I. and B. Poulsen. 1992. *The Temple of Castor and Pollux*, Roma.

Nielsen, I. and J. Zahle. 1985. "The Temple of Castor and Pollux on the Forum Romanum. Preliminary Report of the Scandinavian Excavations 1983-1985." *ActaArch*, 56: 1-30.

Ogilvie, R. M. 1965. *A commentary on Livy, books 1-5*, Oxford.

Olofsson, M. S. 2006. "Herakles Revisited. On the Interpretation of the mould-made architectural terracottas from Acquarossa." In Edlund-Berry, I. E. M., G. Greco and J. Kenfield (eds.), *Deliciae Fictiles III: Architectural Terracottas in ancient Italy: New Discoveries and Interpretations*. Rome: 122-129.

Orsi, P. 1903. "L'Olympieion di Siracusa. Scavi del 1893 e 1902." *MonAnt*, 13: 369-391.

———. 1933. *Templum Apollonis Alaei ad Crimisa promontorium*, Roma.

Ortalli, J. 1990. "Nuovi dati sul popolamento di età celtica nel territorio bolognesi." *Etudes Celtiques*, 27: 7-41.

———. 1994. "Bolognia, Via della Dozza: Svincolo arcoveggio resti di insediamento rurali." In Forte, M., P. v. Eles Masi and D. Baldoni (eds.), *La pianura bolognese nel villanoviano: insediamenti della prima età del ferro.* Firenze: 291-296.

———. 1995. "Bonifiche e regolamentazioini idriche nella pianura emiliana tra l'età del ferro e la tarda antichità." In Quilici, L. and S. Quilici Gigli (eds.), *Interventi di bonifica agraria nell'Italia romana.* Roma: 61-69.

Pallottino, M. 1965. "Rivista di epigrafia etrusca: Roma." *StEtr*, 33: 505-507.

———. 1979. "The Origins of Rome: A Survey of Recent Discoveries and Discussions." In Ridgway, D. and F. R. Ridgway (eds.), *Italy before the Romans: the Iron Age, Orientalizing, and Etruscan periods.* London: 197-222.

Palmer, R. E. A. 1969. *The king and the Comitium: a study of Rome's oldest public document*, Wiesbaden.

Panella, C. 1996. *Meta Sudans: un'area sacra in Palatio e la valle del Colosseo prima e dopo Nerone*, Roma.

Papi, E. 1999. "Vicus Tuscus." In Steinby, E. M. (ed.) *Lexicon Topographicum Urbis Romae*, V: 195-196.

Paribeni, R. 1921. "Saggi di scavi nell'area del Tempio di Giove Ottimo Massimo sul Gampidoglio." *NSc*: 38-49.

———. 1959-1960. "ceramica d'importazione dall'area sacra di S. Omobono." *BCom*, 77: 109-124 & tav. 101-110.

Parise Badoni, F. H. 2000. "L'italia mediotirrenica." In Parise Badoni, F. (ed.) *Ceramiche d'impasto dell'età orientalizzante in Italia.* Roma: 27-34.

Parisi Presicce, C. 1997. "Eracle e Dioniso nella decorazione figurata del tempio arcaico di S. Omobono. Un'ipotesi eterodossa." In Lulof, P. S. and E. M. Moormann (eds.), *Deliciae Fictiles II: Proceedings of the 2nd International Conference on Archaic Architectural Terracottas from Italy held at the Netherlands Institute in Rome 12-13 June 1996.* Amsterdam: 167-177.

Payne, H. and G. M. Young. 1936. *Archaic marble sculpture from the Acropolis: a photographic catalogue*, London.

Pensabene, P. 1980. "La Zona Sud-occidentale del Palatino." *Archeologia Laziale*, III: 65-81.

———. 1990. "Il tempio di Saturno a Dougga e tradizioni architettoniche di origine punica." In Mastino, A. (ed.) *L'Africa Romana. Atti del VII convegno di studio*, Sassari: 251-293.

———. 1998. "Vent'anni di studi e scavi dell'Università di Roma "La Sapienza" nell'area Sud Ovest del Palatino (1977-1997)." In Giavarini, C. (ed.) *Il Palatino: area sacra sud-ovest e Domus Tiberiana*. Roma: 1-154.

Pensabene, P.*, et al.* 1993. "Campagne di scavo 1988-1991 nell'area sud-ovest del Palatino." *Archeologia Laziale*, 11: 19-36.

Pensabene, P. and S. Falzone (eds.) 2001. *Scavi del Palatino I*, Roma.

Pensabene, P., G. Foglia and G. Ioppolo. 1984. *Tempio di Saturno: architettura e decorazione*, Rome.

Pernier, L. 1926. "Il tempio Etrusco-Italico di Orvieto." *Dedalo*, 6.3: 137-164.

Pietrangeli, C. (ed.) 1976. *Guide rionali di Roma. Rione X - Campitelli, I.II*, Roma.

Pinza, G. 1905. *Monumenti primitivi di Roma e del Lazio antico*, Roma.

———. 1914. "Le vicende della zona Esquilina fino ai tempi di Augusto." *BCom*, 42: 117-176.

Pisani Sartorio, G. 1977. "Esame preliminare dei materiali archeologici (Scavo 1974-1975): Parte III." *PP*, 32: 55-61.

———. 1982. "L'area sacra dei templi della Fortuna e della Mater Matuta nel Foro Boario." In Pensabene, P., I. Dondero and L. Campus (eds.), *Roma repubblicana fra il 509 e il 270 a.C.* Roma: 51-56.

———. 1990. "I culti e gli scambi." In Cristofani, M. (ed.) *La Grande Roma dei Tarquini: Roma, Palazzo delle esposizioni, 12 giugno-30 settembre 1990: catalogo della mostra.* Roma: 111-113.

Pisani Sartorio, G. and P. Virgili. 1979. "Area Sacra di S. Omobono." *Archeologia Laziale*, 2: 41-47.

Prayon, F. 2004. "Überlegungen zur Monumentalität frühetruskischer Plastik und Architektur." In Prayon, F., M. Novák and A.-M. Wittke (eds.), *Die Außenwirkung des späthethitischen Kulturraumes. Güteraustausch - Kulturkontakt - Kulturtransfer. Akten*

*der zweiten Forschungstagung des Graduiertenkollegs "Anatolien und seine Nachbarn" der Eberhard-Karls-Universität Tübingen (20. bis 22. November 2003).* Münster: 85-106.

———. 2009. "The Atrium as Italo-Etruscan Architectural Concept and as Societal Form." In Swaddling, J. and P. Perkins (eds.), *Etruscan by Definition: The Cultural, Regional and Personal Identity of the Etruscans. Papers in Honour of Sybille Haynes.* Oxford: 60-63.

Quilici Gigli, S. 1986. "Scali e raghetti sul Tevere in epoca arcaica." *Archeologia Laziale*, 12: 71-89.

———. 1990. "Antemnae." In Cristofani, M. (ed.) *La Grande Roma dei Tarquini.* Roma: 152-153.

——— (ed.) 1986. *Il Tevere e le altre vie d'acqua del Lazio antico: Archeologia Laziale, 7.2*, Roma.

Rasmussen, T. 1979. *Bucchero pottery from southern Etruria*, Cambridge.

Rathje, A. and I. van Kampen. 2001. "The distribution of space and materials in domestic architecture in early Rome. A case study of the pre-republican habitation levels on the *sepolcreto arcaico* site at the Roman Forum." In Brandt, J. R. and L. Karlsson (eds.), *From Huts to Houses. Transformation of anceint societies (Proceedings of an international Seminar organized by the Norwegian and Swedish Institutes in Rome, September 1997).* Stockholm: 383-388.

Regter, W. 2003. *Imitation and Creation: Development of early bucchero design at Cerveteri in the seventh century BC*, Amsterdam.

Rendeli, M. 1989. "Muratori, ho fretta di erigere questa casa. Concorrenza tra formazioni

urbane dell'Italia centrale tirrenica nella costruzione di edifici di culto arcaici." *RIA*, 12: 49-68.

Renfrew, C. 1986. "Introduction: peer polity interaction and socio-political change." In Renfrew, C. and J. F. Cherry (eds.), *Peer polity interaction and socio-political change.* New York: 1-18.

Renfrew, C. and J. F. Cherry. 1986. *Peer polity interaction and socio-political change*, New York.

Reusser, C. 2002. *Vasen für Etrurien: Verbreitung und Funktionen attischer Keramik im Etrurien des 6. und 5. Jahrhunderts vor Christus*, Zürich.

Richter, G. M. A. 1949. *Archaic Greek art against its historical background: a survey*, New York.

———. 1968. *Korai: archaic Greek maidens: a study of the development of the Kore type in Greek sculpture*, London.

Richter, G. M. A. and I. A. Richter. 1970. *Kouroi, archaic Greek youths: a study of the development of the Kouros type in Greek sculpture*, London.

Riemann, H. 1969. "Beiträge zur Römischen Topographie." *RM*, 76: 110-121.

Riis, P. J. 1967. "Art in Etruria and Latium during the first half of the fifth century B.C." In Rieverdin, O. (ed.) *Les Origines de la République Romaine.* Vandoeuvres-Geneve 67-96.

Rizzo, S. 1977. "Esame Preliminare dei Materiali Archeologici (Scavo 1974-1975): Parte II." *PP*, 32: 43-54.

Robertson, D. S. 1945. *A Handbook of Greek & Roman Architecture*, Cambridge.

Rodenwaldt, G. 1939. *Korkyra: archaische Bauten und Bildwerke*, Berlin.

Roller, M. B. 2004. "Exemplarity in Roman culture. The cases of Horatius Cocles and Cloelia." *Clasical Philology*, 99: 1-56.

Romanelli, P. 1984. *Ricerche Intorno ai Monumenti del 'Niger Lapis' al Foro Romano (1955)*, Roma.

Rosi, F. M. 2004. "Osservazioni sul bucchero di Roma e del Lazio." In Naso, A. (ed.) *Appunti sul bucchero: atti delle giornate di studio.* Firenze: 259-268.

Roth, L. M. 1979. *A Concise History of American Architecture*, New York.

Ryberg, I. S. 1940. *An archaeological record of Rome from the seventh to the second century B. C*, Philadelphia.

Santalucia, B. 1994. *Studi di diritto penale romano*, Roma.

Santoro, P. 1986. "I Sabini e il Tevere." *Il Tevere e le altre vie d'acqua del Lazio antico: Archeologia Laziale*, 7.2: 111-123.

Scheffer, C. 1990. "'Domus regiae' - a Greek tradition?" *Opuscula Atheniensia*, 18: 185-191.

Schefold, K. 1993. *Götter- und Heldensagen der Griechen in der Früh- und hocharchaischen Kunst*, München.

Schrader, H., E. Langlotz and W. H. Schuchhardt. 1939. *Die archaischen Marmorbild- werke der Akropolis*, Frankfurt am Main.

Scott, R. T. 1993a. "Lavori e ricerche nell'Area Sacra di Vesta." *Archeologia Laziale*, 11: 11-17.

———. 1993b. "Excavations in the *Area Sacra* of Vesta, 1987-1989." In Brown, F. E., R. T. Scott and A. R. Scott (eds.), *Eius virtutis studiosi: classical and postclassical studies in memory of Frank Edward Brown (1908-1988)*. Washington: 161-182.

———. 1999. "Regia." In Steinby, E. M. (ed.) *Lexicon Topographicum Urbis Romae*, IV: 189-192.

———. 2009. "The Excavations." In Scott, R. T. (ed.) *Excavations in the Area Sacra of Vesta (1987-1996). Supplement to the Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome. No. 8*. Ann Arbor: 1-82.

Sear, F. 1989. *Roman Architecture*, London.

Shapiro, H. A. 1989. *Art and Cult Under the Tyrants in Athens*, Mainz am Rhein.

Smith, C. J. 1996. *Early Rome and Latium: economy and society c. 1000 to 500 BC*, Oxford.

Snodgrass, A. 1986. "Interaction by design: the Greek city-state." In Renfrew, C. and J. F. Cherry (eds.), *Peer Polity Interaction and Socio-political Change*. Cambridge: 47-58.

Sommella, P. 1968. "Area sacra di S. Omobono. Contributo per una datazione della platea dei templi gemelli." *Quaderni dell'Istituto di Topografia Antica della Università di Roma*, V: 63-70.

Staccioli, R. A. 1968. *Modelli di edifici etrusco-italici. I modelli votivi*, Firenze.

———. 1981. "Sul tempio arcaico di S. Omobono." *PP*, 36: 38-41.

Stamper, J. W. 2005. *The Architecture of Roman Temples: The Republic to the Middle Empire*, Cambridge.

Stefani, E. 1944. "Scavi Archeologici a Veio in contrada Piazza d'Armi." *MonAnt*, 40: 178-290.

———. 1953. "Veio. Tempio detto dell'Apollo. Esplorazione e sistemazione del santuario." *NSc*: 29-112.

———. 1954. "Ardea (Contrada Casalinaccio) - Resti di un antico tempio scoperto nell'area della città." *NSc*: 6-30.

Steingräber, S. 2006. *Etruskische Wandmalerei: von der geometrischen Periode bis zum Hellenismus*, Munich.

Stevens, N. L. C. 2009. "A New Reconstruction of the Etruscan Heaven." *AJA*, 113.2: 153-164.

Stewart, A. F. 1990. *Greek Sculpture: An Exploration*, New Haven.

Stopponi, S. (ed.) 1985. *Case e palazzi d'Etruria*, Milano.

Tagliamonte, G. 1996. "Iuppiter Optimus Maximus Capitolinus, Aedes, Templum (Fino all'a. 83 a.C.)." In Steinby, E. M. (ed.) *Lexicon Topographicum Urbis Romae*, III: 144-148.

———. 1999. "Palatinus Mons (Fino alla Prima età Repubblicana)." In Steinby, E. M. (ed.) *Lexicon Topographicum Urbis Romae*, IV: 14-22.

Thompson, H. A. 1940. *The Tholos of Athens and its Predecessors*, Athens.

Torelli, M. 1968. "Il donario di M. Fulvio Flacco nell'area di S. Omobono." *Quaderni dell'Istituto di topografia antica della Università di Roma: Studi di topografia romana*, 5: 71-76, abb.

———. 1982. *Typology & Structure of Roman Historical Reliefs*, Ann Arbor.

———. 2000. *The Etruscans*, Milan.

Trigger, B. G. 1990. "Monumental Architecture: A Thermodynamic Explanation of Symbolic Behaviour." *World Archaeology*, 22.2: 119-132.

Tucci, P. L. 2006. "Il Tempio di Giove Capitolino e la sua influenza sui templi di età imperiale." *JRA*, 19.2: 386-392.

Turfa, J. M. and A. G. Steinmayer, Jr. 1996. "The Comparative Structure of Greek and Etruscan Monumental Buildings." *BSR*, 64: 1-40.

———. 2002. "Interpreting Early Etruscan Structures: The Question of Murlo." *BSR*, 70: 1-28.

Ulrich, R. B. 2007. *Roman Woodworking*, New Haven.

Vaglieri, D. 1900. "Venus Cloacina." *BCom*, 28: 61-62.

———. 1903. "Gli Scavi Recenti del Foro Romano." *BCom*, 31: 97-99.

Virgili, P. 1977. "Scavo Stratigrafico (1974-1975)." *PP*, 32: 20-34.

———. 1988. "area sacra di S. Omobono: una cisterna fra i templi gemelli." *Archeologia Laziale*, 9: 77-81.

———. 1990. "il deposito votivo di S. Omobono." In Cristofani, M. (ed.) *La Grande Roma dei Tarquini: Roma, Palazzo delle esposizioni, 12 giugno-30 settembre 1990: catalogo della mostra.* Roma 129-130.

———. 1999. "Vicus Iugarius." In Steinby, E. M. (ed.) *Lexicon Topographicum Urbis Romae*, V: 169-170.

Viscogliosi, A. 1996. "Iuppiter Stator, Aedes ad Circum." In Steinby, E. M. (ed.) *Lexicon Topographicum Urbis Romae*, III: 155-157.

Wallace-Hadrill, A. 2008. *Rome's Cultural Revolution*, Cambridge, UK.

Ward-Perkins, J. B. 1981. *Roman Imperial Architecture*, New York.

Welin, E. 1953. *Studien zur Topographie des Forum Romanum*, Lund.

Whiffen, M. and F. Koeper. 1981. *American Architecture, 1607-1976*, Cambridge, Mass.

Wikander, C. 1981. *Acquarossa: results of excavations conducted by the Swedish Institute of Classical Studies at Rome and the Soprintendenza alle antichità dell'Etruria Meridionale. Volume 1: The Painted Architectural Terracottas, Part I, Catalogue and Architectural Context*, Stockholm.

Wikander, Ö. 1990. "Archaic roof tiles. The first generation." *Hesperia*, 59: 285-290.

Wilson, A. I. 2000a. "Drainage and Sanitation." In Wikander, Ö. (ed.) *Ancient Water Technology*. Leiden: 151-179.

———. 2000b. "Land drainage." In Wikander, Ö. (ed.) *Ancient Water Technology*. Leiden: 308-317.

Winter, N. A. 1978. "Archaic architectural terracottas decorated with human heads." *AM*, 85.1: 27-58.

———. 2005. "Gods walking on the Roof." *JRA*, 18: 241-251.

———. 2006a. "Le terracotte architettoniche arcaiche di Tarquinia. Scambi e modelli." In Bonghi Jovino, M. (ed.) *Tarquinia e le civiltà del Mediterranea*, Milano: 127-144.

———. 2006b. "The Origin of the Recessed Gable in Etruscan Architecture." In Edlund-Berry, I. E. M., G. Greco and J. Kenfield (eds.), *Deliciae Fictiles III: Architectural Terracottas in ancient Italy: New Discoveries and Interpretations*, Rome: 45-49.

———. 2006c. "Gorgons, Minotaurs and Sibyls: a sharred early Archaic terracotta roofing system at Pithecusae, Cumae and Rome." In Herring, E.*, et al.* (eds.), *Across Frontiers: Etruscans, Greeks, Phoeicians & Cypriots. Studies in honour of David Ridgway and Francesca Romana Serra Ridgway*. London: 249-255.

———. 2009b. *Symbols of Wealth and Power: Architectural Terracotta Decoration in Etruria and Central Italy, 640-510 B.C.*, Ann Arbor.

Winter, N. A., I. Iliopoulos and A. J. Ammerman. 2009. "New Light on the production of decorated roofs of the 6th c. B.C. at sites in and around Rome." *JRA*, 22: TBD.

Wiseman, T. P. 1994. *Historiography and Imagination: Eight Essays on Roman Culture*, Exeter.

———. 1995a. *Remus: a Roman myth*, Cambridge.

———. 2008. "The House of Tarquin." In Wiseman, T. P. (ed.) *Unwritten Rome*. Exeter: 271-292.

———. 2008. "The Prehistory of Roman Hellenism." Presented at *XVII International Congress of Classical Archaeology*, conference held at Rome on 22 September, 2008.

———. 2008. *Unwritten Rome*, Exeter.

Zaccaria Ruggiu, A. 2003. *More regio vivere. Il banchetto aristocratico e la casa romana di età arcaica*, Roma.

Zanker, P. 1990. *The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus*, Ann Arbor.

——— (ed.) 1976. *Hellenismus in Mittelitalien: Kolloquium in Göttingen vom 5. bis 9. Juni 1974*, Göttingen.

Zeggio, S. 2005. "Un santuario alle pendici nord-orientali del Palatino ed i suoi depositi votivi fra età arcaica e medio-repubblicana." In Comella, A. and S. Mele (eds.), *Depositi votivi e culti dell'Italia antica dall'età arcaica a quella tardo-republicana: atti del convegno di studi, Perugia, 1-4 giugno 2000*, Perugia: 63-76.

———. 2006. "Dall'Indagine alla città: Un settore del centro monumentale e la sua viabilità dalle origini all'età Neroniana." *ScAnt*, 13: 61-122.

Zevi, F. 1990. "Il Lazio." In Cristofani, M. (ed.) *La Grande Roma dei Tarquini*. Roma: 149-151.

———. 1995. "Demarato e i re "corinzi" di Roma." In Lepore, E. and A. Storchi Marino (eds.), *L'incidenza dell'antico: studi in memoria di Ettore Lepore*. Napoli: 291-314.

———. 1996. "Aspetti culturali de Roma tra VI e V secolo a. C." In Bacchielli, L. and M. Bonanno Arvantinos (eds.), *Scritti di antichita' in memoria di Sandro Stucchi. Studi Miscellanei 29*. Roma: 301-315.